

1516. By Mr. THATCHER: Petition of numerous citizens of Anchorage, Ky., favoring increase of pensions to Civil War soldiers and their widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1517. By Mr. THURSTON: Petition of four citizens of Ringgold County, Iowa, protesting against the passage of House bill 78, or the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1518. Also, petition of 31 citizens of Cedar County, Mo., protesting against the passage of House bill 78, or the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1519. Also, petition of 14 citizens of Sharpsburg, Iowa, protesting against the passage of House bill 78, or the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1520. Also, petition of 28 citizens of Sharpsburg, Iowa, protesting against the passage of House bill 78, or the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1521. Also, petition of 68 citizens of Taylor County, Iowa, protesting against House bill 78, or the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1522. Also, petition of 23 citizens of Taylor County, Iowa, protesting against the passage of House bill 78, or the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1523. Also, petition of 75 citizens of Taylor County, Iowa, protesting against House bill 78, or the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1524. Also, petition of 35 citizens of Taylor County, Iowa, protesting against House bill 78, or the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1525. Also, petition of 50 citizens of Taylor County, Iowa, protesting against the passage of House bill 78, or the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1526. Also, petition of 30 citizens of Taylor County, Iowa, protesting against House bill 78, or the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1527. Also, petition of 30 citizens of Taylor County, Iowa, protesting against House bill 78, or the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1528. Also, petition of 40 citizens of Taylor County, Iowa, protesting against House bill 78, or the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1529. Also, petition of 42 citizens of Taylor County, Iowa, protesting against House bill 78, or the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1530. By Mr. TILSON: Petition of Charles O. Butler and other citizens of Cheshire, Conn., protesting against the passage of the compulsory Sunday observance bill (H. R. 78); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1531. By Mr. VINCENT of Michigan: Petition of residents of the eighth congressional district of Michigan urging early action on a bill granting more liberal pensions to Civil War veterans and widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1532. By Mr. VINSON of Kentucky: Petition of Carter County (Ky.) citizens on Civil War pension legislation; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

1533. Also, petition of Lawrence County (Ky.) citizens against compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1534. By Mr. WHITE of Colorado: Petition from sundry citizens of Denver, Colo., protesting against the enactment of House bill 78, the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1535. Also, petition of numerous citizens of Denver, Colo., urging the passage of a Civil War pension bill looking to granting increase of pensions to veterans of that war and their dependents; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

SENATE

FRIDAY, January 13, 1928

(Legislative day of Wednesday, January 11, 1928)

The Senate reassembled at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

LXIX—90

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Fess	McKellar	Sheppard
Barkley	Fletcher	McLean	Shipstead
Bayard	Frazier	McMaster	Shortridge
Bingham	George	McNary	Smoot
Black	Gerry	Mayfield	Steck
Blaine	Gillett	Metcalf	Steiwer
Blease	Glass	Neely	Stephens
Borah	Gould	Norbeck	Swanson
Bratton	Greene	Norris	Thomas
Brookhart	Hale	Nye	Trammell
Broussard	Harris	Oddie	Tydings
Bruce	Hawes	Overman	Tyson
Capper	Hayden	Phipps	Wagner
Caraway	Heflin	Pittman	Walsh, Mass.
Copeland	Howell	Ransdell	Walsh, Mont.
Couzens	Johnson	Reed, Mo.	Warren
Curtis	Jones	Reed, Pa.	Waterman
Cutting	Kendrick	Robinson, Ark.	Willis
Deneen	Keyes	Robinson, Ind.	
Dill	King	Sackett	
Edge	La Follette	Schall	

Mr. JONES. I was requested to announce that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. PINE] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are detained in a hearing before the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. My colleague the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] is necessarily detained from the Senate. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

REFUND OF PASSPORT FEES ERRONEOUSLY COLLECTED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a report by the Secretary of State, requesting that section 3 of an act entitled "An act to regulate the issue and validity of passports, and for other purposes," Sixty-ninth Congress, session 1, approved July 3, 1926, Public No. 493, be amended so as to authorize the refund of passport fees erroneously collected otherwise than under the existing authority contained in that section.

I concur in the view of the Secretary of State, and I therefore request of the Congress legislation amending section 3 of the act of July 3, 1926, in the sense suggested.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE,

Washington, January 13, 1928.

SECOND INTERNATIONAL EMIGRATION AND IMMIGRATION CONFERENCE (S. DOC. NO. 40)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith a communication from the Secretary of State, requesting that legislation be enacted to provide funds to cover the expense of this Government's participation in the Second International Emigration and Immigration Conference to be held at Habana commencing March 31, 1928. The Secretary of State sets forth in his letter the reasons why it is considered advisable that the United States be represented at this conference.

I concur in the view of the Secretary of State that this Government should participate in the Second International Emigration and Immigration Conference, and therefore request of the Congress legislation appropriating \$5,000 for each and every expense connected with the representation of the United States at that conference, including travel, subsistence, or per diem in lieu thereof in amounts authorized in the discretion of the Secretary of State (notwithstanding the provisions of any other act), and compensation of employees as the Secretary of State shall consider necessary and authorize in his discretion.

CALVIN COOLIDGE.

THE WHITE HOUSE,

Washington, January 13, 1928.

ELECTRIC-POWER INDUSTRY—SUPPLY OF ELECTRICAL EQUIPMENT AND COMPETITIVE CONDITIONS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, in response to Senate Resolution 329, Sixty-eighth Congress, second session (agreed to February 9, 1925), a report

of the commission on the electric-power industry, Volume II, entitled "Supply of Electrical Equipment and Competitive Conditions."

Mr. WALSH of Montana. This is the second volume of the report made in obedience to a resolution of the Senate. The first volume has been printed and is available to Senators. I think the report ought to go to the Committee on Printing.

Mr. SMOOT. That is where the other went, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I ask that it be referred to the Committee on Printing.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the report will be referred to the Committee on Printing.

THE MIDDLE RIO GRANDE CONSERVANCY PROJECT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the chief engineer of the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District, also signed by a board of consulting engineers, and accompanied by a report by the board, together with a letter by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs briefly explaining the situation, which were referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

REPORT OF THE CHESAPEAKE & POTOMAC TELEPHONE CO.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the president of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the company for the year 1927, with the operations for the month of December only estimated, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Mr. PHIPPS. Mr. President, I send to the desk telegrams and letters in the nature of petitions, together with copy of a response I have made relative to an increased tariff duty on onions. I ask that my letter be printed in the RECORD and that the names of the petitioners and the various organizations be noted, but not necessarily that the papers be printed in full. I ask that the telegrams and letters be referred to the Committee on Finance.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PHIPPS presented telegrams and letters in the nature of petitions from the Montrose County Chamber of Commerce, R. L. Loesch, secretary; H. A. Stevens, president; and H. B. Coffman, secretary, of a meeting of onion growers and dealers, held in Olathe; the Uncompahgre Valley Water Users' Association, by B. S. Tobin, acting secretary, and the Montrose Lions Club, by Walter P. Crose, president, all in the State of Colorado, praying for an increased tariff duty on onions, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

The letter of response of Mr. PHIPPS on the subject is as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
January 12, 1928.

Hon. JOHN F. BETHUNE,
Secretary United States Tariff Commission,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Thanking you for your letter of January 11, transmitting notice of a public hearing next month on the production costs of onions, your records will show that I have earnestly urged an increased tariff duty on this important farm commodity. On August 15 last I presented letters and resolutions from citizens of Olathe, Colo., and later took up this matter with the commission in person, calling attention to the serious situation in Montrose County, and to telegrams from the chamber of commerce, the Olathe Onion Growers and Dealers' Association, the Uncompahgre Valley Water Users' Association, the Montrose Lions' Club, and others interested.

In view of the pending tariff resolution I am now calling such messages to the attention of my colleagues in the Senate, and the extreme necessity for a more adequate protective duty on onions has also been presented personally to the President of the United States.

I desire to impress upon your commission the gravity of the existing situation, especially in the West, as well as the need for raising a higher tariff wall against excessive importations of this important farm commodity. I deeply regret that the commission has found it impossible to recommend an increased duty on onions prior to this time, and sincerely trust that definite action will be expedited in every proper way. Farmers in my State, especially on the western slope, are deeply interested. Will you be so kind, therefore, as to consider this letter as their formal request for early and favorable action on the pending application, and to include their views in the hearings to be held early next month.

Cordially and sincerely yours,

LAWRENCE C. PHIPPS.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD presented the following resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, which were referred to the Committee on Commerce:

A joint resolution memorializing Congress to amend the river and harbor act so as to provide for maintenance of a uniform stage of water in the headwaters of the Mississippi River throughout the year

Whereas the river and harbor act passed by Congress in 1880 provided for the creation of storage reservoirs to impound the high waters of the Mississippi River during the spring and early summer, and to release them during the late summer and fall, so as to produce a greater flow in said river during the low-water season in the interests of navigation, and disregarding the conservation and propagation of fish life in the headwaters of the Mississippi; and

Whereas the raising and lowering of the water in the storage reservoirs created by the War Department under said act has resulted in destroying much of the natural feeding, resting, and breeding grounds of migratory birds, and has affected the value of the property of riparian owners, and interfered with the natural propagation of game fish, and has resulted in the freezing of many thousands of game fishes in shallow bays during the winter months: Be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Minnesota (the Senate concurring), That Congress be, and it hereby is, memorialized to so amend said river and harbor act that the wild life of the State of Minnesota may be protected and propagated, and that said act be amended so as to provide for the maintenance of a uniform stage of water or a definite, fixed, and permanent low-water level in said headwaters throughout the year; be it further

Resolved, That a certified copy of this resolution be transmitted to the Speaker of the House and the Vice President of the United States and to each Representative in Congress from the State of Minnesota.

JOHN A. JOHNSON,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

W. I. NOLAN,

President of the Senate.

Passed the house of representatives the 9th day of March, 1927.

JOHN I. LEVIN,

Chief Clerk House of Representatives.

Passed the senate the 10th day of March, 1927.

GEO. W. PEACHEY,

Secretary of the Senate.

Approved March 11, 1927.

THEODORE CHRISTIANSON, Governor.

Filed March 11, 1927.

MIKE HOLM, Secretary of State.

I, Mike Holm, secretary of state of the State of Minnesota and keeper of the great seal, do hereby certify that the above is a true and correct copy of the resolution filed in my office March 11, 1927.

[SEAL.]

MIKE HOLM, Secretary of State.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas presented the following concurrent resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Arkansas, which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

House Concurrent Resolution 11

Whereas the people of the Nation are not unmindful of the service rendered by the valiant men and women of the country who served in the various branches of the national defense during the World War; and

Whereas it is the universal expectation and desire of all right-thinking people of the Nation that those men and women who sustained disabilities during their service either at home or abroad shall be properly compensated for their injuries and handicaps they sustained; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States has created the United States Veterans' Bureau, charged with administrative duty of awarding and paying compensation to the Nation's defenders who sustained handicaps, nervous, physical, and mental disabilities, resulting from their military service; and

Whereas millions of citizens of the States and Territories of the Union were accepted or called by draft by the Federal Government into military service for the defense of the Nation and its ideals; and

Whereas upon receiving honorable discharge from the military service, said men and women automatically reverted to their prior status as citizens of their respective States and Territories; and

Whereas the United States Veterans' Bureau is depriving thousands of disabled ex-service men and women and their dependents and beneficiaries of the benefits which Congress has provided for them and is, in contravention of the Bill of Rights of our Federal and State Constitutions, "adjudicating" numerous veterans who are suffering from nervous disabilities, insane, and mentally incompetent who are not incompetent, without granting them a "day in court" to defend their liberties and civil rights for the obvious purpose of enabling petty officials of the bureau to dictate the appointment of their own nominee

as guardians, curators, and conservators to receive the compensation award to which such veterans are entitled through the promulgation of erroneous legal decisions and to intricate and insurmountable rules and regulations and requirements: Be it therefore

Resolved (the senate concurring herein)—

SECTION 1. That our Senators and Representatives in Congress be petitioned to use their best efforts in an endeavor to bring about a change in the laws of the United States as necessary to adequately protect the liberty and civil rights of all disabled World War veterans who are suffering from nervous disabilities and who may hereafter apply to the United States Veterans' Bureau for the relief which has been provided for them by the Congress responsive to the desires of the people of this Nation.

SEC. 2. That our Senators and Representatives in Congress be petitioned to use their best efforts in an endeavor to bring about a change in conditions in the United States Veterans' Bureau to the end that those former service men and women of the World War having service-incurred or service-aggravated disabilities may be promptly compensated.

SEC. 3. That a copy of this concurrent resolution be sent to our Senators and Representatives in Congress, to Gen. Frank T. Hines, and Hon. William Wolf Smith, director and general council, respectively, of the United States Veterans' Bureau, Washington, D. C.; to Mr. William J. Winn, department commander of the Arkansas Department, American Legion; to Mr. Thomas M. Kirby, chairman national rehabilitation committee, Disabled American Veterans of the World War, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.; to Mr. Watson B. Miller, chairman national rehabilitation committee, the American Legion, Bond Building, Washington, D. C.; and to Mr. Edwin S. Bettelheim, chairman Veterans of Foreign Wars, Metropolitan Bank Building, Washington, D. C.

February 25. Read and approved.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas also presented a letter in the nature of a petition from Hugh W. Wicker, adjutant, the American Legion, of Little Rock, Ark., praying for the making of a small appropriation from which funds may be drawn for cigarettes and necessary clothing for veterans who are hospitalized and who are not drawing compensation, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. CAPPER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to which was referred the bill (S. 1285) to provide for the further development of agricultural extension work between the agricultural colleges in the several States receiving the benefits of the act entitled "An act donating public lands to the several States and Territories which may provide colleges for the benefit of agriculture and the mechanic arts," approved July 2, 1862, and all acts supplementary thereto, and the United States Department of Agriculture, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 75) thereon.

He also, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill (S. 2277) relating to giving false information regarding the commission of crime in the District of Columbia, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 76) thereon.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. EDGE:

A bill (S. 2524) for the relief of Josephine Doxey; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 2525) granting the consent of Congress for the construction, maintenance, and operation of a bridge across the Delaware River from the city of Philadelphia, Pa., to Gloucester County, N. J.; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. PHIPPS:

A bill (S. 2526) for the relief of Sheldon R. Purdy; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A bill (S. 2527) granting an increase of pension to Julia A. Huston; and

A bill (S. 2528) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Scott (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McNARY:

A bill (S. 2529) for the relief of Mrs. L. E. Burton; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WALSH of Montana:

A bill (S. 2530) for the relief of W. O. Whipps (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIS:

A bill (S. 2531) granting a pension to Charles L. Heintz (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 2532) to provide for the designation of clerks or employees of the Department of the Interior to serve as regis-

ters and receivers in the land offices in Alaska; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Possessions.

By Mr. SHIPSTEAD:

A bill (S. 2533) to repeal the United States grain standards act; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

A bill (S. 2534) authorizing the appropriation of \$65,000 to be expended by the American Section, International Boundary Commission, United States and Mexico, for the purpose of making a survey to fix the boundary between the United States and Mexico, between El Paso, Tex., and Fort Quitman, Tex., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. BRATTON:

A bill (S. 2535) granting to the State of New Mexico certain lands for reimbursement of the counties of Grant, Luna, Hidalgo, and Santa Fe for interest paid on railroad aid bonds, and for the payment of the principal of railroad aid bonds issued by the town of Silver City, and to reimburse said town for interest paid on said bonds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

A bill (S. 2536) to extend the time for which appropriations are authorized under the act entitled "An act to authorize the collection and editing of official papers of the Territories of the United States now in the national archives," approved March 3, 1925; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. REED of Pennsylvania:

A bill (S. 2537) to amend section 110, national defense act, so as to provide better administrative procedure in the disbursements for pay of National Guard officers and enlisted men; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DILL:

A bill (S. 2538) for the construction of a road across the Makah Reservation to Neah Bay, Wash.; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas:

A bill (S. 2539) granting a pension to Pleasant R. W. Harris; and

A bill (S. 2540) granting an increase of pension to Margaret J. Webb (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. SMOOT. I introduce a bill to amend an act authorizing the incorporation of the Smithsonian Institution, and at the same time I ask that the Committee on Finance be discharged from the further consideration of and for the indefinite postponement of Senate bill 1300, a bill for the same purpose but which requires amendment. Therefore I introduce a new bill and ask for the discharge of the committee and indefinite postponement of the bill (S. 1300) to amend an act authorizing the incorporation of the Smithsonian Institution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

By Mr. SMOOT:

A bill (S. 2541) to amend an act authorizing the incorporation of the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on Finance.

LOWER COLORADO RIVER BASIN

Mr. PHIPPS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1274) to provide for the construction of works for the protection and development of the lower Colorado River Basin, for the approval of the Colorado River compact, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation and ordered to be printed.

AVIATION FIELD IN ARIZONA

Mr. ASHURST. I ask unanimous consent, as to Calendar No. 45, the bill (S. 1154) to authorize the use by the county of Yuma, Ariz., of certain public lands for a municipal aviation field, and for other purposes, that it be recommitted to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INVESTIGATION OF SINKING OF THE SUBMARINE "S-4"

Mr. HALE. From the Committee on Naval Affairs I report back favorably with amendments the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 131), providing for a commission to investigate and report upon the facts connected with the sinking of the submarine S-4, and upon methods and appliances for the protection of submarines, and I submit a report (No. 77) thereon.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Will the Senator from Maine permit me to inquire what is the report he has just filed?

Mr. HALE. It is upon the joint resolution providing for an investigation into the submarine S-4 disaster.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. The majority of the committee has filed a written report?

Mr. HALE. A written report.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. And it will be printed.
The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STEWART in the chair). The joint resolution will be placed on the calendar and the report will be printed under the rule.

THE TARIFF AND AGRICULTURAL RELIEF

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 52) submitted by Mr. McMASTER, favoring a reduction of tariff schedules and the consideration of tariff legislation at the present session of Congress.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, before we come to a vote on the pending resolution I desire to submit a few remarks. I have made the statement before that I do not recall any time when there have been so many problems before the country, but so few issues. The problems are many and they are complicated, but they do not strike a political difference that will amount to an issue such as has been the case in every period in the country's history since we have been a National Government. I might enumerate the problems which come before us and which are now pending, in which the parties on either side are as much or more divided among themselves than the parties are divided as between the original contestants.

There is probably to be found an explanation in that situation of our inability to arouse the public on matters of the franchise, because they are apt to say, "What is the difference?" There is really a great difference, however, between the parties on the subject now before us, the question of a protective tariff. I have noted in the last 20 years that difference growing less and less. It certainly is emphasized in the present resolution. It is offered by a Republican. The purport of the resolution is a lowering of the tariff. Just what the extent of that is to be no one knows. All the Senators who have spoken on the resolution on the opposite side of the aisle, except three, have supported the protective-tariff system in reference to particular items and have, therefore, expressed opposition to the resolution. If it is a matter pertaining to the manufacture of straw hats, the State which is employed in that business, represented by a distinguished Democrat, is protected in its interests by the representative speaking against the resolution because he wants protection on that item, to say nothing about other items which have not been mentioned. If the matter pertains to vegetable oils, there are Democratic representatives of the State who will speak on behalf of protection upon those articles.

If it is a case of citrus fruits coming from Florida the distinguished representatives of that State speak for protection. So I could go on and enumerate the various interests that have contended here on behalf of the protective tariff when it is to apply to particular articles. I am not criticizing those who have taken such a position with respect to particular items. The criticism that I offer is that a consistent attitude, it seems to me, would not permit a Senator to speak for protection for an article that his State produces and against protection for an article that other States produce, provided the articles sought to be protected come in competition with foreign imports; in other words, it is a sort of "spotted" protection theory that favors protection for the one article growing in a particular State, but free trade for other articles that are not produced by that State.

So I think I am justified in the statement that the difference between the political parties on this one issue is becoming less and less; in fact, I believe that the southern section of the country, as it becomes a great manufacturing section, will gradually become more and more adherent to the protective theory.

There might be some occasion for surprise in that the author of this resolution comes from a great agricultural State. It is a surprise to me, and as I have listened to the arguments of the proponents of the resolution, especially those who are on this side of the aisle, I think there is an element that is unfortunate to the extent that there is indicated more or less of defiance or of a feeling of retaliation, "We are going to get even; there has been discrimination, it is alleged; and in order that we may relieve these discriminations we are going to do certain things, no matter what may be the ultimate result." I am convinced that such is a very unfortunate plane for a legislative body to operate upon.

This is a very broad principle and the subject should be discussed as a matter of principle. Any suggestion that "we are going to have what we want, no matter what effect it may have upon the general public, or else we are going to pull the house down over our own heads" is like cutting off one's nose in order to spite one's face. I know of no situation that is better expressed by that aphorism than the situation that arises here.

The senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], in my judgment, developed the fundamental proposition that is at the foundation of all tariff legislation, and I believe that he did not make it as strong as the facts will warrant. We are not only coming to be an agriculturally importing country but we are going to reach that condition much sooner than many Senators to-day believe. It is not only because we are in competition with new countries producing the same things agriculturally that we are producing, but it is largely because we are increasing our consumptive power in a marvelous manner without necessarily increasing the acreage tillable in agricultural production. Here is a source of production that is largely fixed; it can not be unlimitedly extended. Stress has been placed upon increasing production to the acre rather than increasing acreage. We have had that emphasis for the last 20 years upon the basis that we have an unlimited, increasingly growing consumptive need, while we have a fixed rather than a growing productive ability. The number of acres susceptible of production is not to be greatly increased, for it is more or less a fixed area, while the consumption needs are bound to increase.

Without an increase of acreage and with an increase of consumptive needs we must increase the production per acre. On that necessity emphasis has been laid for 20 years. As a result of that emphasis we have come to the point where that fixed acreage is producing a surplus which is growing less and will continue to grow less every year, which is inevitable. Before many years consumptive needs, unlimited in character except ability to buy, will be demanding a supply that our country will not be sufficiently productive to meet. Then comes the importation and its competition just as certainly as we are in this Chamber; that inevitable law of increasing needs, with a fixed ability to produce, will compel us to look to other countries. That is the point that was emphasized yesterday by the senior Senator from Idaho. We are bound under existing conditions to become in time an importing country of agricultural products.

Mr. McMASTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FESS. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. McMASTER. As I understand the distinguished Senator from Ohio, he infers that there will soon be need of the importation of additional agricultural products, but that there are already agricultural products upon the free list which need protection. That was the central theme discussed yesterday by the distinguished Senator from Idaho when he delivered his very able speech upon this subject. If it be true that duties are needed upon certain agricultural products which come in free at the present time, that is the argument why this resolution should be adopted.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, that introduces another phase that has been discussed here in more or less of a desultory manner, as to just what this resolution means; whether it contemplates a complete revision of the tariff or whether a revision to be confined according to the wording of the resolution. If it contemplates a revision of the tariff, meaning that rates may be reduced or rates may be increased, that is a different subject entirely. I would not be in favor, I will say to the Senator the author of the resolution, of undertaking a revision of the tariff at this time. I make that statement in order to answer an anticipated question as to whether, if the resolution were changed by incorporating merely the word "revision," I would support it. I could not support a proposal to-day to open up the question of the revision of the tariff, and I will state why in my own time.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SACKETT in the chair). Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. FESS. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question. The resolution in its present form states—

That many of the rates in existing tariff schedules are excessive and that the Senate favors immediate revision downward of such schedules.

I will ask the Senator from South Dakota, if I may, would he not be willing to insert the word "excessive" after the word "such," in the third line, so that there would be no ambiguity? The resolution then would read as follows:

That many of the rates in existing tariff schedules are excessive and that the Senate favors an immediate revision downward of such excessive schedules.

Mr. McMASTER. Mr. President, I have no objection to the insertion of the word "excessive" after the word "such" in line 3. I think it would be superfluous, so far as that is con-

cerned, because the language itself is perfectly plain that it means a revision downward of those schedules which are excessive.

Mr. COPELAND. However, to make it clear so that there could be no doubt, would the Senator be willing to insert that word?

Mr. McMASTER. Yes, Mr. President; I would be perfectly willing, and I ask that that word be incorporated in the resolution.

Mr. COPELAND. I thank the Senator. Now, may I ask the Senator from Ohio a question?

Mr. FESS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. COPELAND. I believe that the position of the Senator from Ohio is exactly the same as my own position. I would not be in favor of a universal or horizontal reduction of the tariff schedules, but if there are excessive schedules they should be reduced. I assume that the Senator from Ohio will concede, in the first place, that if there are such excessive schedules they should be reduced. Am I right?

Mr. KING. Mr. President—

Mr. COPELAND. I hope the Senator from Utah will wait just a moment until the Senator from Ohio answers the question.

Mr. FESS. Did the Senator from New York ask the Senator from Ohio that question?

Mr. COPELAND. I am speaking to the Senator from Ohio. If there are schedules which are excessive, does the Senator believe that they should be lowered?

Mr. FESS. If there are duties which are excessive, meaning by that unnecessary, of course I would be in favor, when the time comes to revise the tariff, of reducing them.

Mr. COPELAND. Does the Senator mean by that that he would not be willing to do it now if it were demonstrated that they are excessive?

Mr. FESS. O Mr. President, the Senator from New York knows very well that talking about revision of the tariff under this resolution at this time is only a gesture. It is mere political "bunk," as the Senator knows, in an effort to provide campaign material for the approaching election. The Senator can not look me in the eye and suggest that he sincerely believes that there will be any effort during the present session of Congress to undertake a revision of the tariff schedules.

Mr. COPELAND. Of course, Mr. President, if this is political "bunk," it is Republican political "bunk," because the pending resolution was presented by a Senator on his own side of the aisle. But I do not believe it is political "bunk"; I think it is a perfectly proper thing, if I may say so.

Mr. FESS. Yes; the Senator believes that the Senate of the United States is not performing a proper function when it is consuming the time in discussing a matter which the House probably will not consider at all and upon which it has to act first.

Mr. COPELAND. If the Senator is asking me a question, I will say that the Senate is performing a proper function when it attempts in any proper way to correct conditions which have interfered with the prosperity of agriculture. Of course, the Senate can not initiate tariff legislation, but certainly, if there are tariff schedules which are excessive and if it can be shown that those tariff schedules are excessive and that by reason of the fact that they are excessive agriculture is imperiled, it would seem to me that every Senator should do everything he could to make possible the revision of those schedules in order that agriculture may be relieved and put on a parity with the other industries of the country.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, the Senator from New York has a perfect right to express his views upon both sides of the question. He is on both sides. He is for protection. That will please the protectionists. He is against protection. That will please the free traders. He has a perfect right to his opinion. This is merely a gesture. There is not a person in this Chamber who believes for a second that this body has any right to deal with this subject from the beginning until a tariff bill comes over from the House. If we have nothing to do here except to talk, it is all right to proceed on that basis; but if we are to proceed regularly on tariff revision it must be admitted by every Senator that there is a way to do it, and that is the constitutional way. When it comes to that I will join in the consideration of the bill in the regular order.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield further?

Mr. FESS. The Senator from New York can make his speech in his own time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I am sure the Senator from Ohio, having criticized the Senator from New York, would not wish to pass the matter over without permitting the Senator from New York to reply.

Mr. FESS. The Senator may reply in his own time, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. COPELAND. Oh, very well, if the Senator declines to permit a reply.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, I was somewhat surprised that this resolution should come from an agricultural State, from a representative of a great section of the country almost entirely confined to the production of agriculture. I was surprised first because it has been my understanding that agriculture is chiefly concerned not in the lowering of rates but in the increase of rates.

As has been stated here before, the very first act that was passed after the close of the war was the emergency tariff act. That was confined entirely to agricultural products. It enumerated 28 of them. There is not a single item in that bill that is not agricultural; and I state here, without fear of contradiction by anyone who knows the facts, that never in the history of this country had a tariff bill been brought before either body and seriously considered that was limited to only one industry until the introduction and consideration of that bill; and it was because the liquidation of the farm situation was most hurtful, and in order to meet it as soon as possible the whole legislation was limited to agriculture.

Then in September of the following year—this agricultural bill having passed in May, 1921—in September, 1922, it was very largely included in the regular, permanent tariff legislation.

I have consulted with the Tariff Commission upon the applications for changes in the tariff. I am amazed at the number of applications that have been made for an increase of the tariff. There have been very few applications for a decrease of the tariff. I have also noted that 40 per cent of the applications for increase are confined to agriculture, and here rises in this Chamber a representative of the great agricultural section and offers a resolution requiring the immediate consideration of the tariff for the purpose of lowering the tariff schedules when the very first and most important schedule would cover the subject of agriculture!

Mr. McMASTER. Mr. President—

Mr. FESS. That is the reason why I was surprised to have this resolution come before us. Later on, after hearing the discussion of the author of the resolution and others who think with him, I came to the conclusion that they themselves are not seriously expecting that that will be done, but are offering the resolution simply as a suggestion that unless certain legislation is carried through looking to the improvement, in their view of the matter of agricultural conditions, there will be an onslaught on the whole industrial and agricultural fabric of the country. I do not think that is wise at all from any point of view.

Mr. McMASTER. Mr. President—

Mr. FESS. Now I yield to the author of the resolution.

Mr. McMASTER. I appreciate very much the fact that the distinguished Senator from Ohio desires to assume responsibility for the reasons and the purposes of the introduction of this resolution. I am very glad to have him attempt to interpret those motives and those reasons, but I want to say to him that he is far off in his interpretation.

In the first place, there are many agricultural products upon which there are no duties, and no one is asking for a reduction of duties upon products of that kind. For example, there are hides, which are upon the free list. Furthermore, the language of this resolution—

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, I want to pay some attention to the Senator's reference to hides. I want to give him some information on it.

Mr. McMASTER. May I continue my question?

Mr. FESS. No; wait until I finish this and then I will let the Senator continue his question.

Many times the Senator and others have mentioned the fact that hides are on the free list as a complaint against tariff legislation. I was in the other body at the time both the emergency tariff legislation and the permanent tariff legislation took place. I will say to the Senator from South Dakota that in the Committee of the Whole we placed hides on the dutiable list, whereupon there was offered a very small compensatory duty upon shoes. Shoes are on the free list and have been for a considerable period of time, and that was one reason for putting hides on the free list—the raw material with the finished product.

The theory of protection is to protect to the extent of the difference in the cost of production. Naturally that must go to labor. Therefore when we come to consider protection, certainly where labor is employed, it will be important; and we considered that if hides were on the free list, in all probability shoes, also on the free list, might be produced in competition with foreign countries. With the raw material on the free list, the finished product was put on the free list.

When an amendment was offered putting hides on the dutiable list, I voted for it in the Committee of the Whole, and then voted for a small compensatory duty on shoes. When we got out of the Committee of the Whole, however, and the matter was submitted to the vote of the House to adopt what had been done in the Committee of the Whole, the House took off the compensatory duty on shoes. Then the House reversed the action of the committee and hides remained on the free list. Later, as the Senator will recall, there was an effort to put hides on the dutiable list in this body. I want the Senator simply to know that I favored putting hides on the dutiable list and voted for it.

Mr. McMASTER. The Senator favors this resolution, then?

Mr. FESS. This resolution proposes to reduce and lower the tariff.

Mr. McMASTER. Oh, yes; it proposes to bring about a closer parity between agriculture and industry. Now, just a moment further.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, the Senator says—

Mr. McMASTER. May I continue?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio further yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. FESS. Not just now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. FESS. The Senator says his resolution proposes to bring about a parity between agriculture and industry, and at the same time he argues that the tariff has nothing to do with it. I do not understand that sort of argument.

Mr. McMASTER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio yield now?

Mr. FESS. I yield now.

Mr. McMASTER. It was very gratifying to me to hear the Senator from Ohio explain why hides were put upon the free list; that is to say, if hides were put upon the free list, then shoes should be put upon the free list.

Evidence has been compiled and data have been placed before the Finance Committee showing that if there were a 15 per cent ad valorem duty on hides it would not affect the price of shoes more than from 2½ to 4 cents a pair; so it was a perfectly square deal, then, to ask the farmers to furnish shoes for all of the population of America when that price was affected only by from 2 to 4 cents and permit their product to go on the free list! As a matter of fact a duty of 15 or 20 per cent upon hides has no significant part in the cost of the manufacture of shoes; and it does not make any difference to me what were the circumstances surrounding the action when hides were put upon the free list. They are upon the free list, and it does not make any difference who was responsible for it; it is time that they went back upon the dutiable list.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, the observation made by the Senator was not the basis upon which the action was taken. There are 6,600,000 farmers. All of these farmers do not produce hides. Only a portion of them produce hides, but there are 115,000,000 people who wear shoes; and the question was whether shoes should go on the free list, because we had reached a point where, in the efficiency of our machinery and labor, we could compete with foreign manufacturers. It was therefore decided that since everybody wears shoes they should go on the free list, since protection was no longer needed. Then the question was whether the raw material that goes into the manufacture of shoes should go on the free list. A majority in both branches took that view.

Mr. McMASTER. Mr. President, does the Senator from Ohio feel that that was an adequate excuse?

Mr. FESS. I do not. That is the reason why I did not vote for it.

Mr. McMASTER. The Senator and I agree, then, on this proposition.

Mr. FESS. On that particular one.

Mr. McMASTER. That alone would justify this resolution.

Mr. FESS. Oh, no; I differ from the Senator about that alone, or any other consideration, justifying this resolution in this body.

Mr. President, next to the production of the farmer's product, his chief concern is where to sell that which he does not use on his farm. I do not speak of it as surplus, because that term applies to what we export to a foreign country. I speak

of the difference between what the farmer produces on his farm and what he consumes on his farm.

Every farmer consumes a small percentage of what he produces. He must look to some one who is not a farmer to consume what he himself does not consume. He can not sell to farmers, for they are producing the same thing he is producing. He must sell to people who are consumers, who are not engaged in the production of the same thing that he is producing. Therefore the chief concern of the producer on the farm is to find a place where people consume who are not farmers. There arises the supreme necessity of building up, on the part of the farmer, industry that is not engaged in farming. That is his only hope. Otherwise all that he could do would be to produce that which he lives upon, and he would have nowhere to sell the product which he wants to convert into money to pay taxes, insurance, interest, and the current expenses of the farm.

It seems to me that every agriculturist should have supreme in his mind a near-home market, as near as he could get it, and a market with great buying power. Otherwise, he has not any profit in what he does.

Mr. McMASTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FESS. I yield.

Mr. McMASTER. I notice that the Senator, as all other Senators who oppose this resolution do, continually brings up the argument that the purport of this resolution is to destroy industry, to destroy the home market for agricultural products. All that this resolution purports to do, so far as industrial schedules are concerned, is to reduce excessive rates, and certainly no Member of the Senate can argue against reducing an excessive rate. If excessive rates are reduced, that protects every legitimate industry in America; it protects legitimate profits of every legitimate industry. That sort of an argument is entirely beside the question and outside of the purport of this resolution.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, that identical argument has been used by the opponents of protection ever since the Government has been organized. You never heard a free trader who would admit that he was willing to break down American industry. Never in my life have I heard one admit that. They always argue that the reduction of the tariff will not do it. We have the history of every Democratic revision of the tariff, that was to do away with the protective tariff, and that statement, every item of it, has been contradicted by the history of our country.

I have been through the Northwest, through the great State which the distinguished author of this resolution represents. I have been through the great State north of it, and through that empire State of Montana, a great producer of wheat and other agricultural articles, and when I talked to the citizens of North Dakota and of South Dakota I found they were not slow to say to me, "The thing we need is people. What we want are more people to consume what we produce, and if physically we could plant near the Dakotas a great center of population, not engaged in agriculture but in industry outside of agriculture, we would boost tremendously the prices of the products produced by the farmer of North Dakota."

But the farmer is compelled to ship his products from North and South Dakota to the Twin Cities in the one case and to the eastern part of the United States, which is the chief consumer, in the other case, and in both cases he suffers heavy transportation costs. Now my friend, whether he means it or not, is proposing to extend the market 3,000 miles across the sea instead of bringing it closer to the place where the farmer is producing his article.

I know the trite argument of the promoters of free trade. They say, "No; it will not destroy the home market; it will have very little effect upon the home market." I say to the distinguished author of this resolution that if you put the American producer of manufactured goods in competition with the cheap labor of Europe by reducing or destroying the tariff, you immediately will put out of employment at least 5,000,000 men in America, as has been done in other days, and when you drop 5,000,000 men from the pay roll you lose \$6,000,000,000 of consumptive power, and if you take out of the buying power of America \$6,000,000,000, what becomes of the home market for the products the farmers raise in South Dakota and elsewhere?

Mr. McMASTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. FESS. I yield.

Mr. McMASTER. I am very much impressed by the able statements of the Senator from Ohio, but I remember that when I was in college I read that same kind of speech; but that was in the days when the two principles of free trade and protection were coming in competition with each other. That was back in the McKinley campaign. I remember reading that speech and

those arguments, and it was a splendid speech along those lines; but it has not a thing to do with the reduction of excess schedules in the present tariff law.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, the Senator is taking refuge under the word "excess," which has been placed in the resolution as a relief to him from the embarrassment of the original resolution. Nevertheless, the proposal is to tear down what we call the integrity of American business, built upon a system of protective tariff. "Unless," they say, "you are going to join with us on some method of bringing the two things together, we will pull the whole house down." That we are told over and over on this side of the aisle. That is the thing that you can not get away from, that if certain things are not going to be done, we are going to pull this fabric down over our heads, and then they say, "Let everybody suffer alike." What does that mean, to let everybody suffer alike? It means that what they appear to feel is a discrimination in tariff legislation in favor of industry as against the farmer, a discrimination intended in the law, that may be easily remedied by amending the law. That position is without foundation. We give to agriculture not only the same protection industry receives, but we give it adequate increased protection over industry.

Every person who is informed knows that the last tariff law, that of 1922, provides a lower percentage of protection on industry than on agriculture; the increased percentage of protection is in favor of agriculture instead of industry. In the face of these facts, we are told over and over that the tariff legislation is against the farmer, on behalf of industry, as if we are choosing industry as a favorite as against one of the greatest industries we have in the country, namely, agriculture.

That is an unfair statement. If the Senator would say that the farmer has not the facility to employ the tariff protection as easily as the manufacturer has, there might be some basis for the statement, but when we are charged in legislation that we favor industry, discriminating against agriculture, the facts belie that statement, for, on the other hand, the favor has been given to agriculture.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator permit a question there?

Mr. FESS. I yield.

Mr. KING. The Senator has, I think inadvertently, because I assume he wants to be entirely fair in his argument, assumed that there is a school in the Senate that is advocating free trade. I think the able Senator who is the author of the resolution before us negatives that very completely, and I ask the Senator if he does not remember that the Walker tariff law, which really was an expression of the economic and tariff philosophy of the Democratic Party, declared in 1846 that the tariff must be levied without discrimination against any section, or against any class, or against any product? The Senator recalls that Mr. Blaine pronounced that to be the greatest tariff act that was ever written, and the Senator must know that there is no one advocating free trade. I do not see why he constantly assumes that there is, because I assume that the Senator, as an educated man, must know that his arguments, in order to carry weight, must be founded and postulated upon facts, and not upon theories which have no foundation in fact.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, let me edify the Senator from Utah by a citation of some history on the tariff question. I had not intended to do that, but he invites it, and he needs it, judging from the statement he has just made.

The first act under the administration of Washington was a protective tariff act, in order to encourage manufactures, to build up a varied industry in this country, and to supply as far as possible a market for the farmer. The tariff became a subject of discussion at once. It was indorsed by Thomas Jefferson. It was indorsed by James Madison.

At the close of the War of 1812 there seemed to be a fear that cotton, which was then coming to be a great article of export, would be militated against if the protective system continued. Consequently there was an effort to repeal the system. Finally a compromise was reached in 1833, handled largely by Henry Clay. The author was quoted yesterday by the distinguished senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH].

In 1846 Robert J. Walker was the author of the famous Walker tariff law of that year, and it is the verdict of history that as soon as it took effect there was a general paralysis of the business of the country that was relieved only by two items. The first was the wide famine in China, which called for much of what we produced. The second was the Crimean War of 1853, which involved the three great empires of Europe in war. Those two items supplied a market not unlike the market of Europe in 1914, and America could sell at a good price everything she could produce. That was the relief from the paralyzing, death-dealing business policy of the Robert J. Walker tariff of 1846.

We have had tariff discussions from that on down to the present time. The famous tariff act, known as the Mills bill, was offered. Then came the tariff of 1893, under the leadership of Grover Cleveland. The inevitable results that followed that tariff act were paralysis of business, capital in hiding, labor out of employment, and general destruction of industry in the land, with a nation-wide suffering of all classes.

Then in 1896, with the country in an indescribable situation industrially, the Great Commoner came out of the West with the assurance that all our trouble was due to our money, that what we needed was silver coined at the ratio of 16 to 1, and he swept the country on the basis that the tariff had nothing to do with the situation, but that it was the money power. We went through that campaign of 1896.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to observe that Mr. Bryan swept the country in July and August, but McKinley swept the country in November.

Mr. FESS. The Senator is right. There is not a doubt in the world that if the election had been held in August, McKinley would not have been elected, but under a campaign of education, in which people began to think as to what would be the effect of the free and unlimited coinage of silver, that position was rejected, and immediately after the inauguration of McKinley in 1897 we had the Dingley bill of that year. Then, again, capital invested in industry, labor was employed at a steady and fairly high wage, and we secured relief from the death-dealing, business-destroying Democratic legislation of the former year.

We have the same thing coming up periodically. Whenever there is a depression in any section somebody comes along and suggests some artificial cure. We had it in the greenback movement of 1878. We had it again in the Populistic movement of 1890. We had it again in the free-silver movement in 1896. We had it last year from the same section upon the same basis, growing out of the same situation exactly—always some artificial method by the Government to cure economic ills. That is the one danger that I see in legislation on a fundamental subject such as the farm situation.

I am not going to quibble whether it is free trade or protection. I recognize that at one time it was tariff for revenue only. That was the Democratic theory. Then Samuel J. Randall came along, a protectionist, and he said "tariff for revenue only with incidental protection." Then we find Underwood coming along and it was "tariff competitive in its character," called "competitive tariff." What is the name they are now giving it? First, tariff for revenue; second, tariff with incidental protection; third, competitive tariff. What will be the name now to be applied? It is all an effort to get away from the name—free trade. To-day we find them defending the protective idea that covers some specific articles of their own localities, but rejecting other articles not in their territory.

Mr. BROOKHART. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. FESS. I yield.

Mr. BROOKHART. The Senator's account of the great calamities which have followed tariff legislation is to some degree accurate. I want to call his attention to the fact that since the enactment of the last perfect tariff bill we have now more than a million farmers who have lost their homes in the United States, and the calamity is greater than all the calamities added together which he has described.

Mr. FESS. Back in 1896 that kind of talk was stigmatized as calamity howling. All over the country we had just that sort of talk. We have not heard much of it until recently it broke out in the Senate. It was voluble yesterday. The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE] undertook to show that in the missions in this city there are being cared for people who have no place to sleep and no food to eat, and gave it as evidence that the country is in a bad state, a bad condition. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] rose and employed as an argument to show that labor is suffering that there are a million people out of employment, and so on. Constantly the discriminations were pointed out between the well-to-do and the poor. They are offered as the results of legislation which they propose to cure here.

Let me say to my friend from Iowa that we have good authority that the poor is with us all the time. There is not a town in the broad scope of America that does not have the indigent. There is not a county in the United States that does not have an institution to take care of the infirm. There is not a city of any consequence which in every year since the war has not, as an expression of gratitude toward or sympathy for the unfortunates, gone into what we call the community chest and made contributions which in cities like

Cleveland will run up to the million mark, and in cities like my own city of Springfield, of 60,000 people, runs up to nearly hundreds of thousands, and so on. Does that mean that the Nation has been negligent and has produced by negligence the indigency which shows in every community and every city and every town?

I have visited the missions here. I want to say nothing unkind—God forbid it—and I do not mean to do it. But we can not find a town anywhere that we will not find people who suffer a lack of this world's goods because of a condition for which we are not responsible and which no legislation can cure.

We can relieve it by our voluntary efforts that show a great charitable spirit in America. These people are not out of work because they can not get the work so much as because they are not able to work or, I might say, in the cases of some of them, not willing to work. I make the statement here that there never has been a time in the history of the world, especially the last year, when there was so universal employment at such a high scale of wage, at such permanent and steady work, with so much of this world's goods generally distributed as in America at this time.

There has been a slowing down since last year. I suppose when Ford's great industry waited production in order to manufacture the new tools necessary for the new plans, with many hundreds and thousands out of employment, we are not responsible for it. I suppose when a great manufacturer sees fit to exchange the old machinery for new and must close down for a certain period in order to do it, that that unemployment is not to be laid to tariff legislation, but it is incident to the growth of the Nation's industry.

Mr. President, the arguments that we have poor in the city of Washington are not conclusive. The arguments that in my own town we have people who need help are not conclusive.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] took occasion to make an effort to prove that labor is not so well employed, and used figures which I tried to correct. The truth about the matter is that there has been a gradual decline in prices, both wholesale and retail, of the articles of industry. If that decline had been a precipitate falling off of prices, it would have been dangerous, but the decline was not precipitate. The decline has been steady, and it is in direct response to efficiency in production. We produced by the same number of people more than we produced before, and we have a greater bulk at the same cost, and that leads to a reduction of the price when it goes on the market.

It is the soundest economy that you or I can conceive to-day that when we reduce the current price in accordance with efficient service we make the cost to the consumer less and we increase the power of the consumer to buy and still lift the standard of living. So that when we speak about the lowering of the prices of these articles it does not mean that business is becoming less active. The truth about the matter is that 10 per cent less producers in 1927 produced 25 per cent more of the products. That is the soundest economy that can be offered, and instead of being looked upon as a suggestion of danger it ought to be looked upon as one of the most promising symptoms of our present day.

That leads me, Mr. President, to say another thing. We have been led by these utterances from the author of the pending resolution and others who think as he does to understand that the tariff is largely the cause of the disparity between agricultural and nonagricultural products, and it is proposed in this way to relieve that disparity. I have stated before that that is not the opinion, so far as I can get it, of agricultural thinkers who meet in Washington representing the various commissions which have been here studying the question.

On the other hand, here is a statement that can not be contradicted: Continuously there has been a gradual decrease of the purchasing dollar of nonagriculturalists up to the present day, and continuously, with a tremendous spurt last year, there has been an increase of the producing dollar of the agriculturalists. In other words, the disparity which in 1919 may have been 51 points came down last year to only about 11 points and pretty nearly disappeared by the end of the year 1927. If the lack of parity, if the disparity, is due to tariff legislation, then why, under a higher protection than before, have we a constantly decreasing price of the nonagricultural products and a constantly increasing price of the agricultural products to-day that are nearly on a parity?

Mr. McMASTER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BINGHAM in the chair). Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. FESS. I yield.

Mr. McMASTER. With reference to the tariff proposition not having any relation to the present condition of agriculture, it certainly must be an economic fact that if in the United States we have four or five separate and distinct classes, if four of those classes are distinctly under a protective system and are benefited by it, and for some reason or some condition the fifth class produces under high costs, but can not obtain the protection of that system, and must sell in cheap European markets, most assuredly the tariff system has something to do with the condition of agriculture.

Mr. FESS. That is just what I was talking about.

Mr. McMASTER. And that is just what I was talking about.

Mr. FESS. Speaking about producing under higher costs leads to the question evidently that the Senator meant that the disparity is due to tariff legislation, and I state that the facts disprove that most conclusively. A disparity of 51 points at a certain date under the old law has come to be negligible in 1927.

Mr. McMASTER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield further?

Mr. FESS. I yield.

Mr. McMASTER. Under the tariff system, whether the tariff has been up or down has made some difference, that is true; but for the last 16 years, with the exception of three occasions, the farmer's dollar has been below par; and it was not during the period of high protection since 1922 that the farmer's dollar reached parity, for during the last six years, under this higher protection, the farmer's dollar has ranged all the way from 69 cents to 89 cents in value.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, I hold in my hand charts which are graphically made to illustrate the curves of the indexes of prices. The chart covering relative purchasing power of a dollar in exchange for commodities shows that from January, 1910, to date agricultural commodities ranged slightly above nonagricultural products in the purchasing power of their respective dollars. That is a chart which I wish my friend to examine, if he does not care to take my word for it.

Chart No. 30 gives the index numbers of farm prices and wholesale prices of nonagricultural products. It shows that prices of agricultural products are slightly lower than those of nonagricultural products, but they are running close together.

Mr. BROOKHART. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. FESS. If the Senator will permit me to proceed, in just a moment I will yield to him.

It is true, and nobody cares to dispute it, that agricultural products have suffered in relative price in the past; there is no doubt about that; and I have thought, in view of that fact, that the Government if it could find a sound method of relief ought to apply that relief, and, Mr. President, I want now to refer to that situation and to state why I favor affording relief that is economically legitimate.

Mr. BROOKHART rose.

Mr. FESS. Does the Senator from Iowa wish to interrupt me?

Mr. BROOKHART. In reference to the charts to which the Senator has referred I wish to call attention to a matter.

Mr. FESS. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. BROOKHART. In the first place, those charts deal with wholesale prices. But the farmer never sells wholesale or buys wholesale, either. He has to operate on a retail basis, and that makes quite a difference.

Mr. FESS. It ought to make a difference the other way, but I am sorry to say that it does not.

Mr. BROOKHART. No; it certainly does not.

Mr. FESS. On the question of giving some relief to the farmers, I desire to say that some persons hold that the problem will, under economic laws, solve itself; that Congress ought not to interfere at all; that if we let it alone it will cure itself. I have not viewed the situation in that way, and I want to state why more than that is involved.

The farmer has to pay for the things he buys a price that is largely due to management, while he gets a price for the things he sells that is subject to the law of supply and demand without being much affected or influenced by management. There is a stabilization of the prices of nonagricultural products due to the regulation of production. Such regulation has been operating for the last 10 years through the commodity committees of the leading units engaged in production with their weekly meetings or at least monthly meetings. They take an inventory; they find whether they are producing for consumption or for storage. When they find they are producing for storage, they know that they are outrunning consumption and they are going to pile up overproduction that will ultimately

cause the whole product to sell for less than a smaller output would sell for.

What a fine example is afforded by cotton. When we produced 14,000,000 bales of cotton—just enough to supply the world's market—we got a certain price, but when we produced 18,000,000 bales of cotton—4,000,000 bales more than were necessary to supply the demand of the world—we got less for those 18,000,000 bales than for the 14,000,000 bales, due to the break of the price, resulting from overproduction. That makes it necessary to regulate production if possible, and nonagricultural industry largely does regulate production. That means prices are stabilized by limiting production within the bounds of consumption. Then, too, prices are stabilized at a high level because labor, which is the chief element entering into the cost of manufactured articles, is maintained at a high level by effective organization; and not only by effective organization but by the willing support to-day of the employer, because to-day we regard it sound economically to pay a reasonably high scale of wages. No longer do we think that profit is measured only by the difference between what it costs to produce an article and the price for which it is sold, and therefore make that margin as wide as possible in order to make the profit large. That would mean few sales. We have substituted for that theory narrow margins, quick sales, and many sales; and we have entered the new economy of making small profits on individual sales, but put emphasis on a large number of sales, that large number being measured by the power of consumption. The concern in America to-day is to increase the consumptive power which is the basis of profits; and for that reason it is a sound economic principle to pay a high scale of wages. So prices are stabilized by management and wages are stabilized at a high rate by organization.

I will say to my friend from Iowa that it is difficult for us to apply the same principle to the farmer; in other words, it is quite difficult to stabilize agricultural prices by a regulation of production and it is quite difficult to stabilize them at a high level, because it is difficult for the farmers to organize. For those two reasons, especially because the price of nonagricultural articles does reflect a certain management that is not wholly due to the law of supply and demand, I would be willing to employ any legitimate plan that is sound economically to assist the farmer in lifting his prices. I offered such a plan in the last Congress.

Mr. BROOKHART. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator that, in my judgment, it is perfectly easy to stabilize prices to the farmers by proper financing and control of the surplus by the control of the domestic surplus. That is what every protected manufacturer who has an exportable surplus is doing. Such manufacturers are selling abroad at less than they get at home.

I wish to state further to the Senator in reference to the index figures which he has quoted from the charts read by him that those index figures are not fair to the agricultural industry at all, because when there is a high index figure there is a short crop, and, while we have been getting a greater total return in money for short crops for a whole generation than we have for long crops—the large crops—yet we can not get enough for either one to pay the expenses and taxes of the farmer. So the index figures which the Senator has quoted are very misleading when they are used to show agricultural prosperity. A high index figure right now is due to short agricultural production.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, to me one of the strongest arguments for the maintenance of a sound protective policy is the increasing high standards of living. There has been a suggestion by one or two Senators that it is a mistake to maintain that we are on a basis of high living standards. I have examined that question from the census reports, and I have in my hand here the figures which indicate an increasing elevation of the standard of living in America.

I have not the figures for 1927, but in 1919 the index figures for savings deposits in the banks and trust companies was 144, while in 1927 the figure was 211. That does not mean a comparison of amounts but it means a comparison per capita as affecting individuals. If it related merely to the amount, the elapse of time would account for the difference, but it does not mean that. Let me say that there are more deposits in the savings banks, representing small depositors, and largely the laboring men, by seven times over than the combined capital in the national banks, the State banks, and the trust companies of the United States. There is a suggestion of the situation of labor to-day. I will add also that there are three and a half times more home owners among the laboring class than there are of home owners big and little, rich and poor in the Kingdom of Great Britain, and I include only laboring men in America.

For members of building and loan associations, representing

the builders of homes, the index figure in 1919 was 41, while in 1926 it was 85, or more than 100 per cent increase.

For sugar consumed during the year 1919, the index figure was 84, while in 1926 it was 117.

For meat consumed during the year 1919, the indicator stands at 138, while in 1926 it stood at 156.

For electrical household appliances manufactured during the year the indicator stood in 1919 at 37 and in 1926 at 55, or an increase of nearly 100 per cent.

In the case of washing machines for domestic use manufactured during the year, the index figure for 1919 stands at 39, and for 1926 it stands at 60; and so I might go on.

In the case of farms receiving electric service from central stations, in 1919 the indicator is 30; in 1926 it is 56, an increase of almost 100 per cent.

That indicates the increase of the standard of living from 1919 to 1926.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] yesterday spoke about wages. The way to find out what the average wage is would be to take the amount of money paid for labor and divide it by the number of laborers. I take those figures from the census report on manufactures. Dividing the total amount paid in wages by the number of wage earners as reported by the census of manufactures, the average annual wage for 1925 is found to be \$1,280; and that does not include merely skilled labor. That includes all kinds of labor, both sexes, all ages, all degrees of skill. The average annual wage in this country in 1925 was \$1,280. I am quite certain there is nothing like it in the history of the world. When a committee recently came over here from Europe to study labor conditions, they were amazed at the number of laborers who owned automobiles, and the number of homes that had in them modern conveniences.

Mr. President, what I am concerned about is whether we are going to yield here to a pressure that is placed upon us in the form of an alternative that "You must do what you regard as an unwise thing, or else we are going to pull down the entire fabric over our own heads." I desire, in the most earnest language I can employ, to say that the American protective tariff, designed to permit the investment of American capital in order to give employment to American labor at an American standard of wages and maintain American standards of living is the most supremely important issue that can come before the American people. If it becomes necessary for us to take this issue before the American people, there is no one fact that is more certain than that they believe in a protective tariff rather than a revenue tariff; and we shall welcome that sort of an issue if those who desire to break down this system are ready to make it.

I would suggest that this resolution be withdrawn. Let not the Senate play with a situation with which it has nothing to do, and become the subject of criticism everywhere where consistency between the two Houses is respected. Let the matter take the proper course of being introduced in the House; referred, if it is thought wise to consider it, to the committee, and then take whatever time is necessary to see whether we desire at this time to revise the tariff system.

My objection to the resolution is that every effort of this kind produces bad effects upon the American people. While I admit that as rapidly as duties become unnecessary—and that often is the case—they should be reduced, and, if we can get along without them altogether, they should be removed, I submit that this is not the time nor place to do it. In 1922, when we considered the bill that is now the law, our friends charged against it that it would destroy the revenue of the country. They wanted a tariff for revenue only, and they asserted that if we substituted a protective tariff we would destroy the revenue. It is well known that the last full year under the Underwood bill the revenue collected was \$322,000,000. This year, under the present law, the revenue is \$605,000,000. That is an increase of pretty nearly 100 per cent in the customs duties. That answers for all time the charge that protective legislation destroys the revenue.

Then we were told that this legislation would destroy our foreign commerce. It is well understood that our foreign commerce, both exports and imports, has continually increased under the present law. In the last few months there has been a little lowering of the exports of the country, but as a rule there has been a gradual increase.

So from the standpoint of revenue, from the standpoint of foreign trade, from the standpoint of employment of American labor, from the standpoint of investment of American capital, from the standpoint of general prosperity, I could not support a resolution like this even if it were pending in the House; much less when it comes up in the Senate, where it has no place.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, a little while ago I attempted a colloquy with the Senator from Ohio, and he said, if I quote him correctly:

The Senator from New York has a perfect right to express his views upon both sides of the question. He is on both sides. He is for protection. That will please the protectionists. He is against protection. That will please the free traders. He has a perfect right to his opinion. This is merely a gesture.

The Senator from Ohio would not permit me to reply in his time, and I am not sure that he will answer any questions that I ask him now; but I should like to ask the Senator from Ohio if the visit of the President to the West last year was a gesture. I should like to ask the Senator from Ohio if the farm relief bill which he presented last year was a gesture.

The Senator says that the presentation of this matter is political bunk. That is a form of political slang which I suppose we can understand.

Mr. BROOKHART. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. BROOKHART. I call attention to the fact that it took the Senator from Ohio a little over an hour and a half to explain that bunk.

Mr. COPELAND. Yes. He spent a lot of time this morning, and I remember when he was making this gesture last year it took him a long time to put over a speech as political bunk.

The Senator says he will not quibble, yet he says if there is an excessive tariff schedule it should be reduced. He does quibble, however, when he says that we must not do anything about the tariff for two or three years, or until some other more convenient season.

The Senator says I am on both sides of this question. I deny it. In my formal address the other day I stated distinctly that I could not vote for the resolution in the form in which it was then before the Senate. Since that time the Senator from South Dakota has revised the resolution. This morning, at my suggestion, he added one word which he says he thinks is not necessary; but the resolution as it is now presented reads as follows:

Resolved, That many of the rates in existing tariff schedules are excessive, and that the Senate favors an immediate revision downward of such excessive schedules, establishing a closer parity between agriculture and industry, believing it will result to the general benefit of all.

I am glad to say that as modified I can vote for this resolution, and I want to say to the Senator from Ohio and to anybody who may be interested in this resolution that I am not on both sides of this question. There are excessive tariff schedules, and it is the duty of this Congress to find a way to reduce those tariff schedules.

Yesterday—I was not in the Chamber at the time—the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN] became excited over this subject. I want to quote exactly what he said about the Senator from New York. He said the Senator from New York did not know anything about how tariff schedules were written.

I admit that I have not had as much to do with the writing of tariff schedules as the Senator from Connecticut. I regard the Senator from Utah [Mr. Smoot] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Fess] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Watson] and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN] as great experts on writing high tariffs, and I plead guilty at once to the statement that I do not know as much about the tariff as these gentlemen do. But the particular thing that the Senator from Connecticut was disturbed about was that in my talk the day before I overstated the amount of added cost to the public involved in the aluminum schedule relating to household utensils. The Senator from Connecticut called attention to a little story I told about the aluminum pot my wife bought to make some preserves, and he said that any man who undertakes to discuss the tariff question in this Chamber ought to be sufficiently considerate of his own reputation to avoid a statement of the kind I made. I assume the Senator means that when I gave the figure of \$2.28 in the case of this particular aluminum pot it was excessive to say that that is what the tariff added to the cost. In a statement earlier in the debate he said that it would be only about half that. He said that I was about 66½ per cent wrong.

Mr. CARAWAY. I do not think the Senator ought to be concerned about it, however. Nobody took it seriously.

Mr. COPELAND. I want to ask the Senator this question: Does the tariff on aluminum utensils add anything to the price the American housewife must pay for them?

Mr. McLEAN. Perhaps I can answer the Senator in this way: The price of the article to which the Senator referred

was in 1919, 1920, and 1921, so far as my investigation shows, higher than the present price.

Mr. COPELAND. I am not interested in that. I ask the Senator this question: Does the tariff law of 1922, fixing a tariff of 11 cents a pound plus 55 per cent ad valorem, add anything to the price the American housewife must pay?

Mr. McLEAN. Since the Senator practically admits that he was 66½ per cent wrong in his statement, I will try to answer him to the best of my ability.

Mr. COPELAND. I hope the Senator will be more than 66½ per cent right when he makes his answer.

Mr. McLEAN. I think I shall be about 100 per cent right, as far as my investigation goes. I endeavored to ascertain as near as I could the price of the article to which the Senator referred—that is, a similar article produced in a foreign country—and I will say to the Senator now that he ought to know, if he is going to discuss the tariff question, that ad valorem duties are not laid upon the American valuation, but upon the foreign valuation of the article.

Mr. COPELAND. The Senator will remember that I said that while this utensil cost Mrs. Copeland \$4.55, we would not make that the basis, but we would take \$3.55. So that would represent the foreign value.

Mr. McLEAN. That saved the Senator from being 100 per cent wrong; it cut him down to 66½ per cent. As near as I could ascertain, the foreign value of a similar article would run from 80 cents to a dollar, although we can not estimate it exactly; can only approximate it. If the Senator will add 50 per cent of a dollar—I will give him the benefit of the largest price—to 33 cents, he will find what the tariff would be, provided a person bought a foreign article.

Mr. COPELAND. Then, when that article got to the American housewife, it would cost 55 per cent of the dollar—

Mr. McLEAN. If she purchased a foreign article. Does the Senator know whether it was made in this country or not?

Mr. COPELAND. It was made in this country.

Mr. McLEAN. Then that is an entirely different question. The Senator will probably find that aluminum ware to-day is cheaper than it was in 1919, 1920, and 1921, under the Underwood tariff, three years after the war closed.

Mr. COPELAND. Just one moment. The Senator is not interested in what the Underwood tariff was. I was attempting to point out to the Senate that the tariff act of 1922 does add materially to the cost of articles purchased in this country, made in this country.

Mr. McLEAN. I did not accuse the Senator of intentionally deceiving the American people, but I do say, and I want to repeat it now, that I have had experience enough in this body to know that again and again Senators will take the floor here and make statements, similar to those made by the Senator from New York, which indicate that they have absolutely no knowledge of the subject they are discussing; and while the Senator did not intend to deceive the American people, I want to say to him that a revision of the tariff is a serious matter, and when such statements are made as the Senator made two days ago, and go out to the American people, that the tax on the aluminum vessel he cited is \$2.28, when in fact it is less than a dollar, I say that it is inexcusable on the part of the Senator from New York.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, that is a very interesting statement and very illuminating and very cheering; but I am on my feet now to be informed by a man who is conceded to be a great tariff expert, and whether he concedes it to himself or not, he at least admits to the public that he knows more about it than I do, which would not in itself make him an expert. The Senator has already conceded that the tariff will add at least a dollar to the price of the utensil.

Mr. McLEAN. I have not conceded anything of the kind. I have said to the Senator that if the article purchased were made abroad about 90 cents would be added to the cost of the utensil.

Mr. COPELAND. By the tariff?

Mr. McLEAN. Yes. The Senator says himself that his wife purchased a domestic article.

Mr. COPELAND. Yes.

Mr. McLEAN. The Senator may speculate until sundown as to what the tariff tax was on that article, but it is my judgment, I will say to the Senator, that unless adequate rates were given to the production of aluminum articles in this country, in order that domestic competition may be maintained, his wife would pay not \$4.50 but double that amount for the articles she uses. I base that statement upon testimony that we received by the cartload when we were revising the tariff in 1922.

Let me explain that to the Senator, if he will pardon me. The Senator knows that the minute these foreign producers get into this market they accomplish what we call "pocketing" the

American producer. The New York importers are in sympathy with the foreign producers. They get these goods abroad, of course, just as cheap as they can. They bring them to this country. The price is so low that the American producer can not compete and he quits. The American people are then absolutely at the mercy of the foreign importer and we had instance after instance where those importers had received a thousand per cent more than the foreign articles cost them.

When the Senator asks me whether this article which his wife bought carries a tax or not, I say that he can speculate on that proposition, but I want to say to him that if it were not for the tariff, if we did not stimulate and protect domestic competition in that article his wife would probably pay double the price she did pay. That is the history of the matter.

Mr. COPELAND. The American housewife ought to be very much obliged to the Republican tariff makers for establishing a tariff schedule which protects them against high prices, which is the argument the Senator makes.

Mr. CARAWAY. And, if I understood the Senator, he said that some articles were a thousand per cent higher.

Mr. McLEAN. That is undoubtedly true. If the Senator heard the remarks of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] yesterday, he will realize that our foreign trade in competitive articles will grow less and less dependable as our competitors across the water avail themselves of our automatic machinery, and make everything that we make at a labor cost of from one-half to one-quarter of what the cost is in this country; and when they combine, as they probably will, and drive the American producer out of the market has the Senator any doubt that they will charge as high a price as they can get and that we shall be at the mercy of the foreign producer? We had that experience with sugar only a few years ago.

Mr. COPELAND. I have no doubt at all that the Senator is right, because they will profit by the experience of the combines in this country, which put the price up just as high as they could, and are continuing to do so; and the Aluminum Trust of America is one of the conspicuous examples.

Mr. McLEAN. The fact is that the Senator's statement is not true. The price of this very article, as far as my investigation goes, is lower than it was five or six years ago.

Mr. COPELAND. Let me ask the Senator this question: If there were not a high tariff or a tariff such as we have suggested in this paragraph, these utensils would come in from the other side, and the American housewife would buy them at a lower price, would she not?

Mr. McLEAN. I have tried to make it clear to the Senator that in all probability she would pay double the price she pays now. I do not want to repeat my statement. That is the experience we go through every time we cut the tariff—drive out the American producer and let in these foreign articles.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, the Senator should be intellectually honest. What is the use of our denying the fact that the tariff does add to the price the American consumer pays for the article? There are reasons why a tariff should be imposed in many instances, for the sake of protection to American labor. I agree to all that, and I believe, in principle, in the protective-tariff system, as the Senator knows. But the point I was trying to make the other day and am trying to make now is this, that we must admit that the tariff is violative of natural law. It prevents the free operation of the law of supply and demand, and necessarily out of it comes an increase in price. I was making this point not to make an attack upon the system but to justify the position taken by these gentlemen who believe in some form of farm relief, that if the great manufacturers of America are to have protection which they get through the tariff system, and if the labor unions are to do and continue what I think is a very wise thing, to deal collectively with the employers and fix the price of labor, we must face the fact that the farmer, who is left in the open field of competition, is not fairly dealt with.

Mr. McLEAN. That inspires me to ask the Senator a question. Does the Senator think that reducing the tariff to a point below the difference in cost of production at home and abroad; that is, to an extent that will necessitate the cutting of wages in this country, would help the farmer?

Mr. COPELAND. No; I do not.

Mr. McLEAN. I am very glad to hear the Senator say that.

Mr. COPELAND. And I am consistent in that position, as the Senator must know.

Mr. McLEAN. I am delighted to hear the Senator say that; and, that being his position, it would seem to me that he would hesitate about voting for the pending resolution.

Mr. COPELAND. Just a moment. I do not want to have the Senator get any false idea from what I have said. I believe that the tariff on aluminum utensils is excessive, and I believe that the tariff upon aluminum is excessive. If the Senator

yesterday heard the speech made by the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] he, too, must be convinced; certainly he did not rise to his feet to question the conclusions of the Senator from Montana, though the Senator challenged the Senate to bring on any question or to raise any issue regarding the conclusions reached by him in his address.

Mr. SMOOT. What were his conclusions?

Mr. COPELAND. The Senator from Montana said, as found on page 1375 of the RECORD:

I wonder if there is any conception among the Members of the Senate as to just exactly what that increase in price of 3 cents per pound on aluminum meant to American consumers.

He was speaking about the ingots and pigs, and not of the utensils, which we were discussing a moment ago.

Since that time the consumption of aluminum has increased very largely. Every manufacturer of household utensils, and particularly every manufacturer of automobile bodies, was called upon to pay 3 cents a pound more for his aluminum on account of this duty as here disclosed.

I have caused a computation to be made—

The Senator from Montana continued—

and I find that since that time that increase has cost the American people, assuming the increase to be 3 cents per pound, not less than \$800,000, and the duty upon sheets and coils unquestionably was at least a million dollars. All this goes to the Aluminum Co. of America, the only producer of crude aluminum in this country. Every dollar of it goes to that company, a gift to the company.

That company is also engaged, or at least one of its subsidiaries, the Aluminum Manufacturers Co., in the production of household utensils manufactured from aluminum, upon which, as we were told by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McMASTER], there is a duty of 11 cents per pound and 55 per cent ad valorem.

The Senator from Montana said that with that duty, which the Senator from Connecticut and I have been discussing, of 11 cents per pound, plus 55 per cent ad valorem—

I have no doubt at all that it realized from that source as much as it did from the other two sources combined. So that this has amounted to a gift to the Aluminum Co. of America, of which Andrew W. Mellon, the Secretary of the Treasury, is the controlling figure, of not less than \$3,000,000 to \$5,000,000.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. President, the Senator from Montana made his statement. I do not know that his statement is incorrect. I have not read it. The Senator from Montana is a very able man; he is now known as the great American investigator; in fact, his friends have suggested that he might well be elected President of the United States upon the splendid record that he has made in this regard. I am somewhat surprised, however, that the Senator from Montana has not gone to the Tariff Commission with this problem. They have the power to recommend a reduction of 50 per cent, and he could no doubt get it through that source.

Mr. COPELAND. Let me inquire if there is not something pending before us in the way of an investigation, not made by the investigating Senator from Montana but by the Attorney General relative to the Aluminum Co. of America?

Mr. McLEAN. He could not reduce the tariff. The Tariff Commission, if they recommend a reduction to the President, might bring about a reduction of that tariff.

Mr. COPELAND. That is to be regretted.

Mr. McLEAN. It seems to me, if I were the Senator from Montana I would try that plan before I urged complete revision of the tariff.

Mr. COPELAND. Does the Senator from Connecticut doubt that the imposition of this tariff has enriched the Aluminum Co. of America to a very considerable extent?

Mr. McLEAN. I do not know. They employ between 20,000 and 30,000 men and pay high wages. It is possible that they have made some money, and it is fortunate if they have. We have to raise between \$3,000,000,000 and \$4,000,000,000 in taxes, and I think it is a good thing that somebody in this country is prosperous.

Mr. COPELAND. Was the Senator from Connecticut here yesterday when the Senator from Montana made his speech?

Mr. McLEAN. I was not.

Mr. COPELAND. I see the Senator from Utah is on his feet. Was he here yesterday?

Mr. SMOOT. No. I just told the Senator I was not here.

Mr. COPELAND. All right. I want to read into the RECORD what the Senator from Montana said:

Mr. President, I challenge any Senator upon this floor to stand here and attempt to make a justification of these rates. They are nothing more than a pure gift to the Aluminum Co. of America of anywhere

from three to five million dollars a year. Senators will bear in mind also that that company is the sole producer of aluminum in America—a perfectly iron-bound copper-riveted monopoly.

That is what he said yesterday.

Mr. McLEAN. The Senator knows that aluminum is not a finished product. It is made from what we call bauxite, I believe.

Mr. COPELAND. I am aware of that.

Mr. McLEAN. My recollection is that several Senators on the other side of the Chamber voted for a tariff on bauxite. I think the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] did, if my memory serves me right.

Mr. COPELAND. May I say to the Senator from Connecticut that it does not make any difference to me how many Senators on this side of the aisle voted that way. I am trying to make clear to the country, if I can, that the protective tariff system, certainly the excessive schedules, has increased the prices of goods consumed by the people of America and that by reason of those increased prices they are contributing to the prosperity of the manufacturers of America. I have no fault to find with that fact.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STEINER in the chair). Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.

Mr. SMOOT. The interest that I have in imposing a tariff upon aluminum and aluminum ware is to keep the industry in the United States. I want to tell the Senator from New York that the Aluminum Co. of America owns, I suppose, 60 or 75 per cent of the raw material of the world.

Mr. COPELAND. I do not doubt it.

Mr. SMOOT. If the United States wants to drive that company out and let those 20,000 employees find some other work, employees who are paid wages as high as, if not higher than, wages in any other industry in the country, that company can establish their business in a foreign country where they get its bauxite, the raw material, and ship the finished material in here free. If the industry was destroyed in the United States and they had the complete market at their control, because they virtually control the raw product of the world, we then would find what the housewife in the United States would have to pay for aluminum ware, and besides that we would not get any revenue from that industry at all.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield to me for a question in that connection?

Mr. COPELAND. Certainly.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I am told that the Aluminum Co. of America has one of the biggest plants in the world on the Saguenay River in Canada, and if this tariff duty were wholly taken off it would be able to supply the needs of the United States from that plant and import the aluminum in pig or in roll form into the United States free of duty.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator, too, that I know it to be a fact that they have one of the greatest water powers in the world at that point, and so far as dollars and cents are concerned the Aluminum Co. of America could go to Canada now and establish their plant at that water power, right at the water's edge. They could establish their industry there and could make aluminum there cheaper than anywhere else in the world. They own properties all over the world, and raw materials are shipped in here.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President, are the raw materials of aluminum shipped in here?

Mr. SMOOT. A great deal of it.

Mr. CARAWAY. Oh, now, Mr. President!

Mr. SMOOT. I know a great deal of it is.

Mr. CARAWAY. Just a minute, if I may interrupt the Senator without getting all excited about it. More than 90 per cent of the aluminum used in this country is mined in my own State of Arkansas.

Mr. SMOOT. I know a great deal is mined in the Senator's State.

Mr. CARAWAY. Bauxite is the raw material.

Mr. SMOOT. They own mines, as I said, all over the world and they could get all the bauxite they want without using a single solitary ton of bauxite from the United States.

Mr. CARAWAY. Why would it be cheaper to ship it to Canada than to manufacture it in this country?

Mr. SMOOT. The water rates do not amount to as much as the railroad rates.

Mr. CARAWAY. But it can not ship by water because it is mined inland.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Does not the Senator know that the richest mines of bauxite in the world are in British and

Dutch Guiana, right at the seacoast, and that the bauxite can be taken and is being taken from there right to the Saguenay plant without ever touching a railroad?

Mr. SMOOT. And unloaded right at the plant.

Mr. CARAWAY. Taken to the Great Lakes borders and unloaded?

Mr. SMOOT. No; unloaded on the Saguenay River in Canada.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. The Saguenay River flows into the St. Lawrence below Quebec.

Mr. CARAWAY. I have heard of it.

Mr. SMOOT. That is where they would establish the industry.

Mr. COPELAND. Does the Senator from Utah contemplate that the lowering of the schedule on aluminum and household utensils made of aluminum, so that it could not be called an excessive schedule, would drive this great company out of America?

Mr. SMOOT. I do not think so. I do not think it would as long as there was sufficient tariff to equalize the difference.

Mr. COPELAND. That is to say, the tariff could be lowered and the company would still continue to make some money?

Mr. SMOOT. I do not say so, and I do not know. The evidence given before the committee was that this was the tariff rate that would hold the industry in the United States, and I know, as I stated, that if the tariff is reduced so that they could produce the goods plus the tariff more cheaply in Canada or at any other place that is where they would go.

Mr. COPELAND. I want to say to the Senator that, of course, I tremble to think what might happen to the housewives of the country and the farmers and the country itself if we did not maintain this excessive tariff on aluminum. I can see from what the Senator says that the foundations of the Republic would be undermined if we were to do it. However, I want to call his attention to a letter which I placed in the Record on January 11, at page 1316, from an independent manufacturer of aluminum in America. He said:

I repeat again that the many independent foundries making parts of automobiles, washing machines, vacuum cleaners, and other household appliances; also the many makers of kitchen utensils would be distinctly benefited by a lower cost on this raw material.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; raw material.

Mr. COPELAND. Yes.

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly; raw material.

Mr. COPELAND. That is all right; but the Senator was finding fault a moment ago with the statement made by the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH], wherein he spoke of the advantage accruing to the Aluminum Co. of America by this increase of 3 cents per pound, which had amounted to not less than \$1,000,000.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the Senator from Utah did not find any fault. The Senator stated that with the situation existing in this country it would be very easy to drive this industry out of the United States. The way to do it is to reduce the tariff so low that it would be profitable for that industry to move to Canada and to make its product there.

Mr. COPELAND. Yes; but the Senator at the same time—

Mr. SMOOT. As to the letter which was read here, the writer buys the raw material, but he does not say anything about the duty on the finished product. He wants free raw material and then he wants just as high protection as possible upon the manufactured goods. That is inconsistent.

Mr. COPELAND. And the Senator from Utah would be opposed to that?

Mr. SMOOT. I am opposed to any duty which is not required and in which there would not be some advantage to the United States. I am not opposed to taking care of the Senator's correspondent. I think he is taken care of, but he wants still more. One of the complaints which the Senator from Montana made yesterday was as to the manufactured product. The gentleman who wrote the letter is not trying to sell his product for less than the American Aluminum Co. sells its product.

Mr. COPELAND. No; he does not do it, because he gets the benefit of the tariff and he takes advantage of it.

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly; in other words, if he did not have a tariff he would not be in business, and he knows it just as well as does the Senator from New York.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Utah is right in that sense, but the Senator from Utah has conceded—he did so a few moments ago—that the tariff on aluminum might be very materially reduced and still not drive the manufacturer out of business.

Mr. SMOOT. No; the Senator from New York suggested that that was the case, and the Senator from Utah did not have an opportunity to answer the suggestion. I will answer it now by saying I do not know whether or not the reduction of

this tariff at the present time and under present conditions would drive the industry out of the United States. I do, however, know that when the subject was under discussion that that was the representation made to the committee, and that the committee believed it, and so did Congress believe it.

Mr. COPELAND. The Senator from Utah knows very well, however, if the Senator from Montana is correct in stating that the profits of the Aluminum Co. of America are \$5,000,000, that lowering the tariff is not going to drive the Aluminum Co. of America from our country.

Mr. SMOOT. If that company could make twice that profit in a foreign country, that is just exactly what they would do. They would go right over into Canada and make the product there; and I know that they are prepared to do it, I will say to the Senator from New York.

Mr. COPELAND. I am ready to believe that the Aluminum Co. of America is prepared to do anything that will benefit the Aluminum Co. of America, but I have not found any evidence anywhere to show that they are seeking to benefit the housewives of America.

I think that out of this discussion has once more been developed the fact—I say “once more” because every time the tariff is discussed the same fact is developed—that the protective-tariff system does increase the price of goods which are consumed by the people of this country. Every time a farmer buys a utensil or an implement, outside of the large farming implements, so called, when he buys a knife or a saw or a chain or a pick axe or a crowbar or a nail or a hammer he is paying an increased price because of the protective-tariff system. If that be true, and if the farmer is contributing to the welfare of the industrial plants of this country, contributing to the welfare of the manufacturers, why does not the industrial world in its turn say to the oppressed farmer, the farmer who is not prosperous, “If there is anything we can do to help you to obtain your share in this protection, we are going to do it”? But that is not the attitude.

I think that on two occasions I was the only Senator east of Indiana to vote for the McNary-Haugen bill. I voted for it twice. On both occasions I said, “The bill is violative of economic law; it interferes with the free flow of goods, and, therefore, it does unquestionably interfere with the law of supply and demand; it is uneconomic; but so is the tariff system, so is the labor-union collective bargaining, and the fixing of wages, which I am glad is being done; so is the fixing of rates on the railroads, permitting railroads to make a certain profit.” All those things, Mr. President, are violative of economic law.

As I view it, in this country we must choose between an attack upon the tariff system and its destruction, an attack upon the labor unions and the destruction of those organizations, an attack upon railroad rates and the structure of railroad rates and their destruction. We have to choose between giving protection to every class in this country or we will have to submit to the destruction of these things which every one of us will admit are for the good of the country.

There is not a Senator on the other side of the aisle who is more convinced of the wisdom, the importance, and the necessity of the protective-tariff system than am I.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, in the present tariff act the rates which were asked for by the farm organizations of this country were inserted.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, why does the Senator give us another bit of talk like that? If I were the Senator from Ohio, I would say that that was “political bunk.”

Mr. SMOOT. It may be “political bunk,” but the Senator is discussing the question of the tariff, as I understand him. Now he brings in the farmer, and from what he has said he seems to think the farmer has not been treated the same as have those who are engaged in other industries. I wish again to say to the Senator that the farmer received exactly what he asked for in the present tariff act.

Mr. COPELAND. The Senator knows full well that the thing for which the farmer asked does not do him any good.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator from Utah does not know any such thing. I know that it does do him good; and I can tell the Senator without a moment's hesitation how it does him good.

Mr. COPELAND. I thought, perhaps, the Senator was going to do that.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not want to take the Senator's time to do it, but I could start—

Mr. COPELAND. I have more than an hour before I will be compelled to leave the Chamber.

Mr. SMOOT. I could start with various agricultural commodities and go through them. Does the Senator think, for instance, that the tariff on wool has not done the farmer any good?

Mr. COPELAND. I think the tariff on wool has done him good.

Mr. SMOOT. Does the Senator think the tariff on sugar has not done him good?

Mr. COPELAND. I think it has done the Senator's State good and the few States which raise sugar beets.

Mr. SMOOT. The State of the Senator from Utah is not the only one that produces sugar beets by any manner of means.

Mr. COPELAND. The farmers have been benefited so far as that particular item is concerned; but, as I said the other day, we could afford to go into our pockets and pay a bounty to the beet-sugar growers of this country in order that the housewives might be saved \$250,000,000 a year by reason of the increased prices which they are compelled to pay because of the tariff duties on sugar.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator from New York has never told the Senate how he would raise that \$250,000,000 revenue for the Government or from what source he would have it come. It would have to be raised in some manner somewhere, because it goes to pay the expenses of the Government. I could go through the list of commodities which the farmer produces and show that the tariff duties have benefited the farmer. If there are any rates in the law which are not sufficient, so far as I am personally concerned, I will be very glad to see them increased.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President, when wheat sells higher in Canada than it does in the United States, how does the tariff on wheat profit the farmer?

Mr. SMOOT. All I can say is that the reports of the Department of Commerce show that not to be the case.

Mr. CARAWAY. That it is not the case?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; it is not the case when the prices of the same grades of wheat are compared.

Mr. CARAWAY. Oh, well—

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator may laugh, but that is what the Department of Commerce states. I had the figures here the other day.

Mr. CARAWAY. I know the Senator did and everybody else had figures here to show the opposite.

Mr. SMOOT. No; everybody else did not have such figures.

Mr. CARAWAY. Just a moment. The Senator has gotten in the habit of disputing everybody's word, so that he does not wait to find out what they are going to deny, but just hollers out “no” almost every time a statement is made. If he would wait a little while, somebody might agree with him at some time. I do not think anybody will, but that might happen, although if it should the one agreeing would be wrong.

But I started to say that the market quotations were put in the Record by the Senator from Iowa where actual wheat was being sold, and they showed a discrimination in favor of Canada of nearly 20 cents a bushel. Of course, the Senator from Utah can say that is not so.

Mr. SMOOT. I have not said anything about that statement. The figures may have related to different grades of wheat. All I say is that the same grade of wheat is not selling for a higher price in Canada than it is in the United States.

Mr. CARAWAY. Yes; I heard the Senator say that.

Mr. SMOOT. And I say that I can prove it by our Department of Commerce.

Mr. CARAWAY. One may prove anything by the Department of Commerce. If what the Senator from Utah has just said can be proven in that way, then, anything can be proved in that way.

Mr. SMOOT. That may be proved, for it is an absolute fact.

Mr. CARAWAY. Can the Senator say that of his own knowledge?

Mr. SMOOT. From the way in which we obtain knowledge, I can say it.

Mr. CARAWAY. Knowledge is obtained, of course.

Mr. SMOOT. And that is the way all knowledge is obtained.

Mr. CARAWAY. I can not receive a statement like that with any seriousness at all. Now, if the Senator from New York will pardon me for a moment.

Mr. COPELAND. Certainly.

Mr. CARAWAY. The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN] took us all to task yesterday for our utter lack of knowledge or accuracy, and then made this most wonderful statement. I desire while he is present to refer to it. He said:

The American people are just absolutely at the mercy of the foreign importer, and we had instance after instance where these importers had received a thousand per cent more than the article cost them.

About the highest rate of duty at all, as I understand, is 100 per cent; and how could even the Senator from Connecticut explain in what manner a hundred per cent duty could keep

out an article on which there was a thousand per cent profit? I ask the question in the interest of accuracy, because that statement comes from the side where accuracy has its habitat. Yet we are asked to take that kind of statement seriously.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. President—

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President, let me say—

Mr. McLEAN. I presume the Senator thinks I ought to have an opportunity to reply?

Mr. CARAWAY. Of course; but I heard the Senator take a week at it.

Mr. COPELAND. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. McLEAN. The Senator from Arkansas says that I took a week at it. This indicates that the distinguished Senator from Arkansas himself can make statements that are far from correct.

Mr. CARAWAY. It is as correct, however, as saying that an article on which there is a thousand per cent profit can be kept out by a hundred per cent duty. The Senator, of course, did not take a week; it merely sounded that long to those who were listening to him.

Mr. McLEAN. The Senator from Connecticut said that it appeared to the committee when we were revising the tariff that in some instances the American producer had been "pocketed," as they call it; that is, importers had brought articles from abroad until they had driven the American producer out of market or had destroyed his market.

Mr. CARAWAY. But we could not protect the American producer against an article on which there was a thousand per cent profit by imposing a duty of 100 per cent, could we? What would be the use of putting a duty on such an article unless the duty were placed at a thousand per cent?

Mr. McLEAN. The rate fixed was of no use in some instances.

Mr. CARAWAY. What was the use of making a gesture and giving a man 100 per cent protection against an article sold at 1,000 per cent profit?

Mr. McLEAN. The Senator fails to understand the situation.

Mr. CARAWAY. I know I do not understand it, and I never will be able to understand it.

Mr. McLEAN. This situation arises: When the American producer of these articles is in what they call a "pocket," he has no market; would-be purchasers do not buy of him, but they buy of the importer, and when they buy of the importer and there is no domestic competition the retailer is then in a position to charge about anything he pleases. That appeared in evidence, and the evidence was not contradicted. The Senator will remember that the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. Gooning] mentioned item after item here of which the retail price was ten times the price which the importer paid for the foreign article. That is what I said.

Mr. CARAWAY. The Senator meant to imply, if he meant anything, that the tariff was the thing that was preventing the American manufacturer from running against a 1,000 per cent profit, and he made that statement when he was lecturing the Senator from New York and aspersing all of us on our side for inaccuracy; and it was such a striking example of accuracy that I merely wanted to call attention to it.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, if I may resume—I thank both Senators for assisting in the debate—the Senator from Utah mentioned wheat.

Mr. SMOOT. I did not mention it.

Mr. COPELAND. The Senator spoke about the tariff on wheat.

Mr. SMOOT. No; I replied to the question that wheat was less in this country than in Canada.

Mr. COPELAND. Anyhow, wheat has been mentioned, and that leads me to say a thing or two about it.

One reason why I am personally so interested in some form of relief for the farmer is because of the wheat situation. There is a lot of talk up in the Northwest about the St. Lawrence Canal, and how a canal from the Great Lakes to the sea somehow or other is going to help the wheat farmer of the West or Northwest. Of course, I am opposed to that canal. I believe that if we are to build such a canal we should build it across New York State to the headwaters of the Hudson River; and in attempting to develop the reasons for that conviction I made a study of the wheat situation.

I wonder how many of us have looked into that situation. Last year we exported about 100,000,000 bushels. Canada exported 250,000,000 bushels. Why is it that Canada can take care of its surplus wheat and we can not? It is that surplus that is giving the farmer the trouble.

The reason why the Canadian wheat goes to the Liverpool market is because it can go to the Liverpool market at a

price far below the possibility of raising and selling American wheat. The absurdity of the St. Lawrence Canal project is shown by the fact that it would only facilitate the removal more cheaply of more Canadian wheat. You can take wheat in Canada from Saskatchewan and Alberta to the lake head at Port Arthur for 28 cents a bushel. To take wheat from Montana to Duluth at the lake head costs 44 cents a bushel. There is a difference of 16 cents a bushel in freight alone between American-raised wheat in the American Northwest and Canadian-raised wheat in the Canadian west.

We never can compete with that situation. We must face the fact that somehow or other we must either eat our own surplus or find some other way of disposing of it. That means this, as I see it: There must be found some way to equalize the American cost of producing wheat and marketing it or disposing of it and the price of the foreign article, just exactly as there is the necessity of equalizing the price between American production and foreign production. In other words, if the farmer is to have any degree of prosperity in the future he must have some form of farm protection.

The whole purpose of everything I have said to-day or any other day in connection with the pending resolution is to emphasize the fact that the protective-tariff system does increase the price to the American consumer and that the farmer is a large contributor to that increased price. The American farmer is affected by the labor-union situation, which I approve, as I have said repeatedly. If we are to permit the protective-tariff system to remain intact, and to permit labor to continue its collective bargaining, we must give equal protection to the farmer; and the logic is irresistible, so far as I can see.

Mr. BROOKHART. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. COPELAND. Certainly.

Mr. BROOKHART. The Senator mentioned the relation of labor and the labor union to this matter. Apparently the Senator agrees with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Fess] that that increases the farmers' costs very greatly.

Mr. COPELAND. Yes, sir.

Mr. BROOKHART. I desire to call the Senator's attention to the fact that the total gross production of manufacturers in the United States is about \$60,000,000,000, and of that labor gets only about \$11,000,000,000; so the benefits to labor in this situation are not much greater than the benefits to the farmer.

Mr. COPELAND. Yes. I thank the Senator for what he has said. We can not question at all the relationship of the labor union and the fixing of price for their work to costs on the farm.

I own and operate a farm about 25 miles from New York, and labor upon my farm is influenced very greatly by the price of labor in the city. I have to pay an increased price for labor upon my farm because of the high price of labor in the city. That is a matter of no particular concern to me because my kind of a farm would never make a living for anybody, anyhow; but when the farmer is dependent upon his crop, and particularly where he is a one-crop farmer, there must be found for him some permanent and sure means of relief. Therefore I would apply exactly the same method of protection to the solution of the farmer's problem that we applied to the solution of the manufacturer's problem, and the same measure of relief that the labor union got when it started to deal collectively.

That is where I stand. The Senator from Ohio is most unjust when he intimated that I was trying to carry water on both shoulders. I am not. I believe in a protective-tariff system, but if there is an excessive schedule I want it reduced. It is only right that it should be reduced. I do stand here to say, however—and if I were the only Senator in this body to say it I would still say—that the farmer is entitled to the same measure of relief that we have given through the protective-tariff system to the manufacturer. It is the duty of the Senate, as I see it, to endeavor to find some means of solving this great economic problem and giving relief to our basic industry.

THE MERCHANT MARINE

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, the able Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] yesterday pointed out the fact that there has been a very large increase in the exportation of wheat to foreign ports from Canada. He indicated that if the present tendency continued, Canada would shortly obtain a large percentage of the wheat export business which the United States heretofore has enjoyed. The suggestion of the Senator from Idaho led me to consult some statistics, and I have been surprised at the information revealed. The extent of the decline in the exportation of wheat from the United

States has been most marked. The increase in the exportation of wheat from Canada has been amazing.

Mr. President, I call the attention of Senators to these figures not only because they confirm the fears expressed by the Senator from Idaho but they also open up another subject for consideration.

The entire shipments of wheat from the port of Montreal in 1920 were 44,121,000 bushels. In 1921 the shipments were 50,112,000 bushels. In 1926 the shipments were 90,000,000 bushels—a gain of more than 100 per cent in six years.

Now, let us consider what were the exports of wheat from all the ports of the United States. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1927, there were exported 156,250,000 bushels of wheat, as compared with 293,268,000 bushels in 1921 and 208,321,000 bushels in 1922—a decline of almost 100 per cent in the exportation of wheat from the United States.

These figures show the inroads which Canada is making into the wheat-export business of the United States, and they also show what is of equally great importance—that the Canadian Government policy of supporting and maintaining a merchant marine of its own has been of tremendous assistance in increasing the export business of Montreal and other Canadian ports.

Canada has a merchant-marine policy. We have none. Canada has given preferential freight rates to farm products. We have not. Canada has, through its own transportation systems, what is called a national interest in developing export business. We have none.

These figures might well cause alarm to the wheat-growing sections of America. But I present them not so much to emphasize the need of attention to and study of the agricultural problem which has been called to our attention by the zealous Senators from the Western States as to refer to the importance and need now of an American merchant-marine policy—definite, unmistakable, and comprehensive.

To indicate to what an extent the nearest port in the United States to the Montreal port has lost business as a result of the advantages which the Montreal port enjoys by reason of favorable freight rates of the Government-owned railroads and because of the Government's keen, anxious, and willing support of shipping facilities, I ask you to study a comparison of the figures of grain exports from the port of Boston and of wheat exports from the port of Montreal.

The exports of grain from Boston to foreign ports in 10-year periods from 1906 were:

Year ending Dec. 31:	Bushels
1906	18,204,757
1916	33,274,441
1926	3,492,721

The exports of wheat from Boston in 1916 were 3,775,000 bushels and in 1926 were 225,000 bushels.

In Montreal the amount of wheat exported has increased in 10 years from approximately 14,298,000 in 1916 to 90,000,000 bushels in 1926. In five years the port of Montreal has increased its export of wheat 100 per cent, while its nearest American port has decreased its export of grain (including all wheat) from 33,000,000 bushels to 3,000,000 bushels.

The intention of Canada to further reduce traffic through our ports is well indicated by the recent request of the Canadian Railroad Commission that the rates from Buffalo to St. John and Halifax be made the same as the rate from Buffalo to New York, disregarding the fact that the haul from Buffalo to Halifax is twice as long as the haul from Buffalo to New York.

In 1923 the number of bushels of grain exported from the following ports were:

Year ending Dec. 31:	Bushels
Montreal	120,013,038
New York	87,130,000
Baltimore	41,083,000
Philadelphia	32,107,000
Boston	9,387,662

The development of the port of Montreal and other Canadian ports reflects the policy of the Canadian Government. A continuation of this policy can only be counterbalanced by placing our ports in a favorable position with regard to rail and ocean port differentials for the sake of "national interest."

Mr. President, I call attention to these figures to ask the Senate to give some thought to the importance of a definite merchant-marine policy before the same story will be repeated in regard to the exports of other products than wheat.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield a moment for a question?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. SMOOT. I think the first address I made in the Senate was in behalf of a merchant marine. I believe in it with all my heart. I would like to see legislation to bring it about. I wanted to ask the Senator what form of merchant marine he

would approve—a subsidy sufficient to equalize the difference in the expense of maintaining a merchant marine by American labor as against a foreign country, or some specific amount issued to any party or parties who may become interested in maintaining a line of ships between this country and other countries?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I am pleased to answer the question of the Senator from Utah. Under present conditions, as the situation now exists in this country, I am in favor of a Government-owned and a Government-operated merchant marine. I see no other solution of the question. I have reached that conclusion somewhat reluctantly, for I want frankly to say that I would much prefer a privately owned American merchant marine than a Government-owned merchant marine. I am fully aware of the abuses, the difficulties, and the waste resulting from Government operation. But there is no other choice. I am opposed to subsidies of any kind or character. I do not believe the shipping interests of this country have any more right to a subsidy to maintain shipping upon the high seas than the railroads, or the manufacturing, and the agricultural interests have a right to a subsidy. I consider the giving of subsidies one of the most dangerous evils that can creep into any governmental system.

Mr. President, I would try to carry out the intent and purpose of the shipping laws that are now upon the statute books providing for an American merchant marine. I consider that the shipping act of 1920 now in operation provides the support for an adequate American merchant marine first and last. The intent of Congress was not to abandon the advantage that we had at the end of the war from having a merchant marine costing billions of dollars that brought the flag of the American Republic into every port in the world. When the act was passed, it was never intended, it was never expected, that we would recede from the progress we made during the years of the war. The fault is not with the absence of law, it is with the policy and manner in which the law has been administered.

To be sure, it was provided in that act that we should seek and keep before us the purpose to convert our Government-owned merchant marine into the hands of private individuals, when such interests could develop and maintain a merchant marine; but it was never intended to declare our triumphant and superb American merchant marine that we inherited from the war bankrupt. It was never intended that at the end of the World War after building up an American merchant marine it should be liquidated, should be destroyed, as it practically has been by the policy that has since been pursued. As I understand that policy, it has been to get these ships into the hands of private owners at any sacrifice, under any circumstances, to discourage Government operation, and to get the American Government out of maintaining an American merchant marine. The trouble we are now experiencing—and I am in hearty accord with the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] on this proposition—is due to the fact that the present law has not been given sympathetic execution by those in charge of the merchant marine policy of our country.

I think I have answered the Senator's question by stating that under present circumstances, with Government-owned ships in our possession, with the great need and importance of maintaining a merchant marine as an auxiliary to our Navy, I am in favor of a vigorous, positive, enthusiastic development of our merchant marine, and of abandoning the policy that has been pursued in recent years of destroying it, or taking the very lifeblood out of it by delaying, postponing, and discrediting the opportunity to give a real trial of Government operation.

Mr. President, as a matter of defense, regardless of our commercial necessities, I am heart and mind for a Government merchant marine—not one that would compete with the limited private American shipping interests now on the seas but as an auxiliary to them.

I arose, Mr. President, for the purpose of calling attention to the problem of the export of wheat, and to point out that it involves not only the great agricultural problem of the West, but it involves the question of whether Canadian ports and the Canadian merchant marine are eventually to transport all the wheat and much of the other export business of the country. Canada has already made tremendous advances, as I have pointed out. I do not hesitate to say that, linked with this agricultural question, is the importance of providing facilities for transporting at reasonable rates, speedily and regularly, to the ports of the world this most important export product of the American people.

I hope that attention will be given before many weeks have passed to the legislation pending here seeking to resuscitate, to put life, to put vitality into our merchant marine, and to establish a definite policy which will declare us either in the

business or out of the business of shipping. So far as I am concerned, while 67 per cent of our commerce is carried in foreign bottoms, and until private interests are able to take care of much of this large percentage, opposed as I am to ship subsidies, I am for a Government-owned merchant marine. I urge the Senator from Washington [Mr. Jones] to ask for prompt action on his bill which I understand seeks this end.

THE TARIFF AND AGRICULTURAL RELIEF

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I have thus far taken no time upon the pending resolution, and now I shall ask the attention of the Senate for only a brief moment. If I thought that this body had any authority to act upon this question at this time I would still not be in favor of action, because I do not believe that at the present time it is wise or opportune to undertake the great subject of revision of the tariff. But I shall not go into that feature of it, because there is another reason which to me is controlling.

The Constitution of the United States is perfectly clear upon this proposition. The first paragraph of Article I, section 7, reads as follows:

All bills for raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives; but the Senate may propose or concur with amendments as on other bills.

I had the honor to serve for a brief period in the body at the other end of the Capitol. I am not unacquainted therefore, as other Senators are not unacquainted, with the attitude which that body takes upon revenue bills. They very jealously defend their rights under the Constitution. If I were a Member of the House, as I once was, I do not hesitate to say that if the Senate should adopt a perfectly inane and futile resolution of this kind and send it to the House of Representatives, I should hope that the House would not only not consider it, but would simply refuse to receive it. In my judgment, in undertaking to act upon this proposition we are absolutely beyond our authority and are doing something which, if we do it seriously, will raise in the minds of people who are thoughtful and who are acquainted with the Constitution a very grave question as to the sincerity and the information of the Senate.

Mr. McMASTER. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. WILLIS. I yield.

Mr. McMASTER. As I understand the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Ohio, no Member of the Senate or the Senate itself is to have an opinion upon any particular question until it is sanctioned by the House.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I said nothing of the kind and thought nothing of the kind. If the Senator got that impression, his facilities for obtaining impressions are bad. Of course, any individual Senator has a right to his opinion, but when it comes to the point of wasting a week or 10 days of the Senate's time in the discussion of and possibly final adoption of a resolution upon a matter which the Senator himself knows is absolutely beyond the scope of the authority of the Senate, as far as I am concerned I do not propose to participate in such action, and shall therefore vote against the resolution.

Mr. McMASTER. I would like to ask this question of the distinguished Senator from Ohio: If in his judgment he thought this resolution were perfectly proper and if in his judgment the Constitution permitted the United States Senate to initiate revenue legislation, would he vote for this resolution under those circumstances?

Mr. WILLIS. The Senator has so many "ifs" in his question that I do not know whether I followed it or not. But I say to him frankly that I am opposed to this resolution, even if the Senate has authority to adopt it. Is that what the Senator wants me to say?

Mr. McMASTER. Why?

Mr. WILLIS. Because I do not believe that the present time is an opportune one for going into a revision of the tariff, and I would not vote for the resolution if it were here in legal form. That answers the Senator's question. But that is not the reason upon which I proceed.

I shall vote against the Senator's resolution, much as I dislike to do so. I should like to vote for any resolution which he sponsors, but I can not bring myself to believe that I ought to vote for a resolution which puts the Senate in a perfectly ridiculous and senseless attitude, and I am not going to do it.

Mr. McMASTER. In other words—

Mr. WILLIS. I think I have stated it very well without the Senator putting it in other words. I think I have made myself understood, so I hope the Senator will not endeavor to put it in other words.

Mr. McMASTER. I would not want to ask any embarrassing questions.

Mr. WILLIS. The Senator from Ohio is perfectly willing to hear any question his friend wants to ask, but he is not willing to have his attitude stated in other words. I will do my own stating, and I have stated that I think the adoption of such a resolution is absolutely beyond the power of the Senate and that therefore I shall not vote to have the Senate do a futile thing and adopt a resolution which, if passed anywhere, must originate in the House in accordance with the provision of the Constitution I have just quoted.

Mr. SACKETT. Mr. President, I would like to fortify the opinion which has just been given by the distinguished Senator from Ohio as to the absolute futility of the pending resolution, which states—

That many of the rates in existing tariff schedules are excessive, and that the Senate favors an immediate revision downward of such excessive schedules, establishing a closer parity between agriculture and industry, believing it will result to the general benefit of all.

It is perfectly evident to every Member of the Senate that any resolution of that kind that we could pass would be of no greater value than asking the Members of the House to give a party and invite the Members of the Senate as their guests. As a revenue measure it can not originate in the Senate.

It is also futile for another reason, it seems to me, in that it is a resolution which attempts to limit the scope of the inquiry into tariff duties. I know of no attempt to revise the tariff at any time in history which has limited the question of revision to the revision downward of schedules which are excessive or has limited revision otherwise, without giving an opportunity to any industries to have inadequate tariff duties increased. Certainly many branches of agriculture to-day need a revision upward.

Mr. McMASTER. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Kentucky yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. SACKETT. I yield.

Mr. McMASTER. Just what language is there in the resolution that would not permit the changing of the agricultural schedules? What language is there in the resolution that would not permit the adjustment of almost any schedule we have in the tariff law?

Mr. SACKETT. It says the revision shall be downward.

Mr. McMASTER. And to what end, and what further purpose is expressed in the resolution? Does it not provide that revision shall be undertaken in order that agriculture may be brought nearer to a parity with industry? It is the same old interpretation put upon the resolution by every other Member in this body who opposes it. There is always some excuse, something about the language that is not just quite right to suit them. I will assure the Senator from Kentucky that if he will vote for the resolution, and if the resolution shall become effective, there will be ample opportunity to raise all the duties that he has in mind in regard to agricultural products, and I take exactly the same position. We will have also the same opportunity to reduce some excessive schedules.

Mr. SACKETT. But that is not the language of the resolution.

Mr. McMASTER. If the language were changed to suit the Senator, would he vote for it?

Mr. SACKETT. Not for a resolution to raise revenue originating in the Senate, which the Senate has no right to pass and which would not be compatible with the dignity of the House.

Mr. McMASTER. Does the Senator think the United States Senate has no right to express its opinion in regard to any matter?

Mr. SACKETT. No.

Mr. McMASTER. He does not think so?

Mr. SACKETT. No; I do not think so.

Mr. McMASTER. He thinks the Senate is gagged and bound?

Mr. SACKETT. No; I said I do not think that. But when the Constitution provides the place where measures providing for the raising of revenue shall originate, then I think it is time to stop and consider the kind of resolutions we send to the House. A resolution of this kind, which in its terms places a limit upon the scope of the inquiry which the tariff revision may take, is a resolution also which I can not favor for the reason that there are many industries in my own community, both in industry and in agriculture, which decidedly need a revision upward.

I can not subscribe to the doctrines which have been enunciated on the floor of the Senate from time to time that the tariff does not afford a protection to agriculture. I think that is a

statement altogether too broad. There are many branches of agriculture to which the tariff to-day does afford protection and without which it would be in a very serious condition. I can say to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota that the tobacco schedules to-day are a great source of revenue to the raisers of tobacco in the whole country, and without those duties the present wonderful tobacco fields of the country would be a shamble and that industry would be undoubtedly destroyed. It furnishes a good illustration, however, of the working of the tariff in agriculture, because there are some kinds of tobacco which, though protected by a duty, are export goods and, with a lack of demand in the export market, the tariff that is placed upon that kind of tobacco does not protect it.

Mr. McMASTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SACKETT. I will.

Mr. McMASTER. I am under the impression that if the Senator had remained in the Chamber during these debates—

Mr. SACKETT. The Senator was here most of the time.

Mr. McMASTER. There are some statements which he has made that I hardly think he would have made had he been here all the time. I do not remember of any statement being made absolutely to the effect that protection did not aid agriculture, but I have heard the statement made that the protective duties which we have upon wheat, and possibly upon millions of dollars worth of other agricultural products, are inoperative. I have heard that statement made, but I have heard no such statement made in regard to the duties being ineffective on all products.

Mr. SACKETT. Neither have I.

Mr. McMASTER. I can not imagine what there is in the resolution that has anything to do with injury to tobacco growers in America. Can the Senator see anything in the resolution that would injure them?

Mr. SACKETT. The Senator will remember what I said. I did not say there was anything in the resolution that would injure the tobacco growers of America. I said the tariff that exists on tobacco to-day was a great benefit to the tobacco industry and without it we would not be able to raise tobacco in profusion in this country. But the instance is also there of a class of tobacco which depends for its market upon export sales, and the export market is to-day so depressed that no amount of duty placed upon that particular kind of tobacco can save that industry. That but serves to draw the distinction between those articles of agriculture which are dependent upon export, which can not be protected by any amount of duty, and those articles which depend upon the home market for their main consumption.

If there were real opportunity under the resolution or any other resolution to go into the question of a change of tariff schedules where they are shown to be excessive in industry, it would be my desire to see those schedules corrected. While a believer in the tariff as a protection to American industry and as a means of building up the market for all the products of both American industry and American agriculture, I am not such a protective advocate as to desire to see any industry unduly protected or to have the rates which protect it excessive. Under a general opportunity for a revision of the tariff any excessive rates would receive my wholesome condemnation, but under a resolution of this kind, even if it were possible to bring about a revision of the tariff by the passage of the resolution, we would not have opportunity to go into the tariff question as a whole. As I said, I know of no previous time in our history when a revision of the tariff was limited to revision downward of certain schedules that should be revised.

The tariff is becoming more and more an exceedingly important question to the section of the country which I have the honor to represent in part, not only as to my State, but the entire South. I say to my colleagues who come from that section that the matter of tinkering with the tariff may mean more disaster to that part of the country to-day than to any other section. Within the last five years industry has been seeking a location within the Southland because of the advantages that come to it through climate, through the wonderful transportation facilities, and through labor conditions. On account of the resources of power which are now available in those sections, industry has been going into every State in the South, and more and more those industries have been able to prosper during the five years last past. To-day it forms a great reservoir of opportunity to industry, and as industry grows in every State, more and more will the people become dependent upon a protection which shall permit them to operate and manufacture as against the countries of Europe with their lower wage schedules and scale of living.

For that reason I feel that any question that is raised to-day about a change of the tariff has an effect upon the business of

the South. If this were a real resolution that could have an eventual outcome of a change of the tariff schedule, we would feel throughout the country already a falling value in industry. The evenly balanced business machine of this country responds almost immediately to any suggestion that may come from the National Congress that the tariff schedules of the Nation are in danger of readjustment. Immediately we find business people beginning to haul in their horns lest they shall be crippled in the final outcome of tariff revision.

The Senate has been discussing this resolution for tariff revision now for a number of days, and no student of the markets represented in this country will for one moment think that the people of America believe there is the slightest danger of tariff revision under the resolution. It has fallen as a "dud" in the markets of the country. How different is that from the time when, at the beginning of an administration, a real tariff revision has been undertaken and business has immediately felt the discussion and felt it in every market in the land.

For that reason I can not but believe that this resolution is the outcome of a feeling of disappointment because the necessary agricultural legislation, in the opinion of those who come from the wheat States, was not enacted at the last session of Congress, a feeling of disappointment that has caused them, as was so well said this morning, to be willing to take the position that if they can not have the kind of legislation out of this Congress that would in their judgment bolster up the business of those communities, they are willing to pull the house down upon the shoulders of the people in retaliation.

Such an attitude does not gain my support even for the purpose of revising the schedules which I know are unjust and unworthy.

Mr. McMASTER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield to me for just a moment?

Mr. SACKETT. I am about through and shall give the Senator the floor in just a moment, if he will let me.

Mr. McMASTER. I should like to ask a question.

Mr. SACKETT. Very well.

Mr. McMASTER. The Senator then admits that there are excessive and unfair and unjust schedules in the present tariff act?

Mr. SACKETT. I am afraid there are.

Mr. McMASTER. That is all.

Mr. SACKETT. Yes; but I do not think, Mr. President, that when we begin talking about the unfair and unjust schedules of the present tariff act, the adjustment of which might help agriculture, it is very helpful immediately to bring up the aluminum schedule. Aluminum, of course, undoubtedly used by many agriculturists, but aluminum is a comparatively new article. We who happened to live before aluminum household utensils were available to the people of this country had the use of other household utensils, and those same household utensils can be used by agriculturists to-day without paying the tariff that is charged to the aluminum industry. That tariff may be just; it may be unjust. There is nothing before us to predicate a judgment as to that, except the fact that a company that enjoys the benefit of that tariff is prosperous. It may be the tariff is too high; if it is too high I should like to see it lowered; but the use of aluminum is not necessary to the agricultural interests of this country.

I recall that in my early days I saw household utensils made of granite ware, and I see the same character of household utensils in the stores to-day. So the use of aluminum upon the farms in any of the forms in which it is used to-day comes about by reason of one of two things—either it is cheaper than the thing for which it is a substitute, or it is so much better for the price that the users willingly pay the higher cost.

There are some schedules of the tariff which, in my judgment, ought to be revised downward, but there are some industrial schedules that ought to be raised. There is an industry in my own State and in the neighboring States for which I have been working with the Tariff Commission for more than two years, trying to get an advance in the schedules. I refer to the rag-rug industry. It seems a small one; but the warp of those rugs is made in factories and then it is sent into the mountain districts where in many households rags are pulled through the warp by the use of hand looms. It furnishes a means of livelihood to thousands of mountain families who have very little opportunity to earn money in other ways. Since 1920 a flood of rag rugs from Japan and China has deluged the domestic market. The increased importation in 1925 over 1924 was more than 2,000,000 square yards out of a total of 2,750,000 square yards altogether. The influx into this country of those rag rugs, produced by the cheap labor of the Far East, has destroyed the industry in the Kentucky mountains and the

mountains of Tennessee and of western Pennsylvania. That is an industry which is loudly calling for the help of the Government in order to maintain itself. Without an increase of the tariff sufficient to compensate for the difference between the cost of production in Japan and China and the domestic cost the people of those sections of the country must be deprived of the benefit of that industry. For that reason I say that if there is to be any revision of the tariff I can not consent for a moment to vote for a resolution which provides that only schedules that shall be revised downward shall be considered. Schedules that should be revised upward interest me fully as much on behalf of the people of my section as do the schedules that should be revised downward.

Another great industry which is being built up in that section of country and in the neighboring States is the dairy industry. That industry shows the need of further tariff protection against the importation of milk and cream and butter from across the Canadian border. It has been found that close to the great markets that industry grows faster than does any other industry of the central, southern, and northern sections of the South. It meets the direct competition of the people of Canada. That industry, too, should be given an opportunity to present its claims before I would consent to the passage of the resolution as now framed, limited to a revision downward of some few schedules that have been pointed out, and some of which, as I before stated, have little or no relation to the agricultural interests.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I yield my unstinted admiration to the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McMASTER] for the courage of his present adventure. I think certainly he has performed a very useful service. I have no sympathy with the arguments that are made that the Senate should not express its opinion upon any matter that is germane to that which concerns us in legislation or that which in any way concerns our people. I have no sympathy with the adjectives that have been hurled at the Senator from South Dakota because he has had the temerity to touch a subject such as the tariff. I congratulate him upon his very able presentation of this subject, and I congratulate him upon the fact that there has been a debate upon it which ought at least to be enlightening to the Senate and possibly to the country.

Mr. President, I think I understand, too, the reasons actuating the Senator from South Dakota and some of those who are aiding him in the presentation of a resolution of this kind and character. I understand, I think, better than some of our brethren here what rankles in the souls of the men in the Middle West and particularly of those who are engaged in agriculture, the very basic industry of this Nation.

I think I understand, sir, something of the catastrophe which has befallen the farming industry during the past few years, and I confess the deepest interest and an entire sympathy in anything which may be undertaken to alleviate the distress of the farmers of this land, and in anything, no matter how mistaken it may be in the opinion of some of our supposedly wise brethren, that may be undertaken by those who represent the farming communities to relieve and aid their people.

I desire, Mr. President, though, to obtain the necessary relief and to go at the matter the other way around; not by an endeavor to decrease the tariff or even indefinitely to revise it, for making a tariff law we who have dealt with the subject in the past have learned is a complex and a delicate and a difficult task. Under any circumstances it is delicate and it is difficult; under the circumstances at the present time it is more than delicate and more than difficult. So, sir, instead of touching this complex and this delicate and this difficult subject, in the endeavor to give the farmer his parity as described in the resolution in respect to the tariff, I would rather go to the specific and affirmative mode of agricultural relief, and by a definite act do him tardy justice.

I believe, sir, in anything which promises agricultural relief. I do not care that it may be determined to be bizarre by some of our distinguished economists and by many gentlemen from the East who have not the slightest conception of what is transpiring in the West. I do not care that gentlemen who arrogate to themselves all of the economic virtues or individuals who are coining their money out of eastern business say to us that what we endeavor to do for the farmer is empirical wholly and is quite beyond the pale of what they believe to be sound economics. If there is anything, any measure which promises relief, which gives even the possibility of relief to the men and the women and the children who have suffered in the Middle West, I will accept that measure, the McNary-Haugen bill or any other, in the endeavor to give something of relief to those who sorely need it.

In the endeavor to strike a parity in relation to the benefits that are derived from the tariff, the parity to which the farmer

is entitled, I would go around in that way and I would do it by specific and definitive measures presented upon that subject, and that subject alone. I do not desire to do it by going in the other direction and undertaking the task, which ever is delicate and which in this instance is more than difficult, of revising, altering, or amending the present tariff law.

To revise downward excessive rates is something that I can scarcely wholly comprehend. I recognize that there are excessive rates; I recognize undoubtedly there are rates that ought to be reduced in a tariff law; but, coming from the West, coming from a territory that has asked tariffs and has received tariffs upon those things that come from the soil, I am not ready at this period and at this session to rest upon the determination of any of our eastern brethren as to what may be excessive rates in a tariff bill. What may seem to be excessive rates in a tariff upon the industrial products of the East to me would seem to those of the East quite the reverse; while what might seem to be excessive rates on the products of the soil of the Pacific coast to those who live in Massachusetts would seem to me to be, indeed, less than ought to be accorded.

Mr. McMASTER. Mr. President—

Mr. JOHNSON. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. McMASTER. As I understand the distinguished Senator from California, he would not favor a reopening of the tariff law, owing to the fact that he would not trust the interests of California to eastern interests and to their ideas in regard to tariff rates upon agricultural products raised in California. Then, as I understand, according to that theory, we must never again bring up the question of tariff revision?

Mr. JOHNSON. No; not at all, sir. Indicating an opinion here and asking the House to revise rates downward is a very different proposition from taking up a tariff bill in the regular course of legislation in the Congress of the United States. I do not wish to put it quite as harshly as the Senator did, that I would not trust our eastern brethren as to rates which should be accorded to the fruits, the nuts, and other products of the soil of the Pacific coast; but, sir, I would prefer, if there were to be any revision concerning the rates on those products which are grown upon the Pacific coast, myself to be a part of that revision, and to be a part of the determination whether or not any rate was excessive.

Sir, I violate no confidence, and say what is really a matter of history when I recite how the rates were obtained for the territory of the Senator from Oregon and the territory that I represent on the Pacific coast when the tariff bill was under discussion in 1922. We formed a bloc then. Rail at blocs, as you see fit, sir; say what you will regarding any organization within the organization of the Senate; but when the tariff bill was under discussion we formed what was termed a western bloc; and we formed it for protection of our States and our products. It embraced about 25 Senators from the West; and those 25 Senators appointed an executive committee of five, of which I had the honor to be one; and that bloc said to the gentlemen from the East, who were concerned alone in an industrial tariff, "All right, gentlemen; the West, with its 25 votes in the United States Senate, is finally going to have a tariff that suits the West"; and the West got a tariff that suited the West upon the products of the soil.

Blocs, of course, in mock horror, our eastern brethren say, are terrible things; dangerous, too; but, nevertheless, the organization of the West in 1922 effected the result at that time of giving to the West a modicum of that which had always been taken by the East; and I am very glad that we organized, and very glad that the result was attained.

Mr. McMASTER. Mr. President—

Mr. JOHNSON. I yield.

Mr. McMASTER. I want to congratulate the Senator upon the work of the bloc during that session. I think they did obtain most substantial results; but did they obtain everything that the farmers asked for? Not by a long way. The testimony before the Finance Committee shows that the farmers asked for higher duties on many things, and those duties were cut. Notwithstanding that, I agree with the distinguished Senator from California that that bloc did put up a most magnificent fight, and they got so much more than they had ever gotten before that it was really a victory.

Mr. JOHNSON. That is right; and I may say to the Senator from South Dakota that when the tariff bill comes here again, if I happen to be a Member of the Senate at that time and the Senator from South Dakota happens to be a Member, I hope we will form again a western bloc; and we will not only get what we got before but we will get all of the things that the Senator from South Dakota would like to get to-day. I will aid him in then getting them to the best of my ability.

I recall, sir, the tariff that we then obtained. It is a singular thing that our tariffs in the West, generally speaking, are very

different from the tariffs in the East. Our tariffs relate to those things that come up out of the soil. They are very valuable to us, just as the tariffs that the Senator from South Dakota would have for his territory are very valuable to him. Ours are walnuts and almonds and olives and olive oil, lemons, and other products—things that come up out of the soil, and that under certain circumstances come into the fiercest kind of competition with things that are grown abroad.

I remember when the first question and the first contest came upon lemons here. The late lamented Senator from the State of Pennsylvania, Mr. Penrose, was then chairman of the Finance Committee. Upon this floor the State that I represent in part was represented then by one gentleman of the Democratic Party and one whose party is Republican. After a contest by the Republican Senator from California, who now speaks, for an increased tariff on lemons, the Senator from Pennsylvania accorded it in the emergency tariff bill; and for the first time in the history of the State of California we had a tariff upon lemons approaching justice. The rate was subsequently carried into the general tariff bill.

I recall subsequently the tariff that we sought upon almonds. Do you realize, sir, where the opposition came from? Every great confectioner in the East came down to Washington. Some of our distinguished brethren from New Jersey, I recall particularly, and from some of the New England States as well, marched into the Finance Committee—the Senator from Utah [Mr. Smoot] will recall that fact—and, representing these great confectioners, they were demanding that we should not place a tariff upon almonds at all, because they could get a second-rate almond from Europe that would enable them to make their confectionery at a little less cost; and so great was the power of these confectioners of the East that it was only by the slightest margin of a very few votes before the Senate itself that we were enabled to obtain the present tariff upon almonds.

So it was upon walnuts. The Senator from Oregon and I stood side by side in making that fight. So it was upon olives and upon olive oil, with which we came in direct competition with our brethren across the sea. It was done, sir, because we organized; and we organized upon the theory that whereas tariff bills had been written in the past around the wants and the wishes and the profits of New England we were going to have, even if injustices might occur in that bill, at least a part of a tariff bill written around the production of the Western States of the United States of America.

I am afraid to touch those schedules now, sir. I would rather go to the relief that ought to be accorded the farmer the other way around, by a specific relief bill; and I will go the limit in that endeavor to give relief to agriculturists. I can not under the circumstances, sir—and I regret it, because of the author of the resolution and because of my sympathy with the fight he is making—I can not, sir, vote for the resolution that he has presented here now.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Barkley	Edge	McMaster	Schall
Bayard	Fess	McNary	Sheppard
Bingham	Frazier	Mayfield	Shipstead
Black	Gerry	Metcalf	Smoot
Blaine	Gillett	Neely	Steak
Blease	Hale	Norris	Steiger
Bratton	Harris	Nye	Stephens
Brookhart	Hawes	Oddie	Swanson
Broussard	Hayden	Overman	Thomas
Bruce	Healin	Phipps	Trammell
Capper	Howell	Pittman	Tyson
Caraway	Johnson	Ransdell	Walsh, Mass.
Couzens	Jones	Reed, Mo.	Walsh, Mont.
Curtis	King	Reed, Pa.	Warren
Cutting	La Follette	Robinson, Ark.	Wheeler
Deneen	McKellar	Robinson, Ind.	Willis
Dill	McLean	Sackett	

Mr. BROOKHART. I desire to announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. NORBECK], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. PINE], the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are detained on business of the Senate in the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. JONES. I desire to announce that the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK] is detained from the Chamber in the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

I also desire to announce that the Senator from California [Mr. SHORTRIDGE], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. WATERMAN], and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. GREENE] are detained in a meeting of the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. President, I desire to offer an amendment to the pending resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 1, line 3, strike out the word "schedules" and insert the words "excessive rates."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, in support of the pending resolution, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter just received by me from Mr. J. K. Wells a constituent of mine residing in Oklahoma City, Okla.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA., December 19, 1927.

HON. ELMER THOMAS,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: If I believe that the high protective tariff was good for the West, Middle West, and the South, I would certainly vote the Republican ticket. Not only that, but I would move to Illinois or Iowa and run for Congress, advocating a high protective tariff on both wheat and corn as a means of helping the present deplorable conditions of the farmers. If anyone can show me where a high protective tariff ever benefited any farmer in the South, West, or Middle West, with the exception of the beet-sugar, cane-sugar, rice, and wool-growing farmers, I will make them a present of the best suit of clothes that can be bought in Oklahoma City. The old argument of the protective tariff Republican is that on account of the high tariff schedules the eastern manufacturing industry is enabled to pay higher wages to their employees and consequently they are able to buy the products of the farm and pay more money for them. I will ask you if the highest-paid mechanic in the steel mills of Pittsburgh pays one cent more for a bushel of Kansas wheat than the peasants that sweep the streets of London? You know they pay just the same less the cost of transportation. I will also ask you if the highest-paid textile worker in the mills of New Bedford pays one cent more for a yard of calico spun in their own mills of cotton grown in Jackson County, Okla., than the coolies of China who work for 6 cents per day? You know they pay just the same less the cost of transportation in their favor. I will grant you that by virtue of the high protective tariff the high-wage earners may perhaps buy a little more of the farmer's wheat and a little more of his cotton products, but this is negligible, as you know. Under Cleveland's administration the farmer received on an average of about 65 cents per bushel for his wheat and it cost about 43 cents to produce it. Under Harding's and Coolidge's administrations the farmer has received about \$1 per bushel for his wheat and it has cost about \$1.05 to produce it. Mind you 65 cents under Cleveland's administration is worth about \$1.15 at the present time. It is true that we have a tariff of 14 cents and 28 cents on wheat but it just about as ineffectual as the prohibition law is in Breathitt County, Ky., or in the Bowery district on the east side, New York City. We are producing from 800,000,000 to 900,000,000 bushels of wheat annually and consuming at home about 600,000,000 and exporting about 200,000,000 bushels per annum. This tariff act was passed to fool the farmers of the West and Northwest. Do you think for one moment if we produced only 400,000,000 bushels of wheat annually and had to import 200,000,000 to supply our domestic consumption that the Republicans would retain our present tariff schedules on wheat? Not for one moment. These schedules would be repealed immediately and our President and Senator Smoot would tell the farmers it was all done in their interest to make them more prosperous.

I was both astonished and astounded when I read in the President's message to Congress wherein he said that everything the farmer sold was on the protected list and everything he bought was on the free list when just the opposite is true. I can not for the life of me understand how anyone occupying such an exalted position could so misstate the facts. I also read with considerable interest and astonishment the speeches of Senator REED SMOOT setting forth our prosperous conditions brought about by the high protective act of 1922. Since and including 1922 more than 80 per cent of the banks of the State of Montana have failed, more than 75 per cent of the banks of North Dakota, more than 67 per cent of the banks of South Dakota, more than 55 per cent of the banks of Iowa, more than 20 per cent of the banks of Nebraska, more than 65 per cent of the banks of New Mexico, more than 38 per cent of the banks of Oklahoma, more than 21 per cent of the banks of Kansas, and more than 16 per cent of the banks of Texas have failed; more than 25 per cent of all the farms in Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Iowa have been sold on the auction block; more than 1,500,000 farmers moved to the city annually, and tenantry has increased more than 2 per cent annually in this country. I ask you, sir, do you call this prosperity? In 1850, 65 per cent of the population of the United States resided on the farm; now less than 40 per cent reside on the farm. If the country is so prosperous as they would have us believe, why are people leaving the farm so rapidly? I have never yet seen intelligent people run from money or prosperous conditions. Give us five years more of prosperity under the Republican protective tariff and you will have half of the farmers in the South, West and Middle West in the poorhouse.

I will grant you that industry is prosperous, but at the expense of agriculture. I will grant you that transportation is prosperous by vir-

tue of the Esch-Cummins Act, but at the expense of the farmers who constitute the bulwark of American prosperity.

The high protective tariff act is nothing more or less than a highway-robbing scheme to rob the West, Middle West, and Southwest for the benefit of the manufacturing East. I have just as much respect for a highwayman who takes my watch and money away from me in some dark alley with a six-shooter as I have for the Republican administration who robs me through the protective tariff act. One is done in defiance of all law and the other is done with the sanction of law and by virtue of the all-powerful industrial East.

There can be no prosperity for the farmers until the expense of production is decreased through a repeal of the tariff schedules and the placing of farm machinery on the free list, reduction of transportation rates and strict economy in public expenditures.

I hope you and I will live long enough to see the West and Middle West voting for their own financial interest rather than the way the great industrial East wants them to vote. When they wake up they will be voting solidly with the South against the present tariff schedules.

I want to thank you for the December issue of the *Tariff Review* which you recently sent me. I have read every article in it and analyzed carefully the one by Commissioner Brossard on How Farmers are Benefited by the Tariff. To my method of reasoning it is most illogical. The most phenomenal idea in it was the statement that the Tariff Commission, of which Mr. Brossard is a member, after arduous labor, research, and investigation "had reduced the duty on quail from 50 cents to 25 cents on each bird." No doubt this one act of this commission accounts for the prosperous condition of the farmers, as set forth in the President's message to Congress and by various speeches and statements from Senator REED SMOOT. Another such an extraordinary act by this commission in the interest of the farmers and we will have such a plethora of money in circulation throughout the United States, and Oklahoma in particular, that we will no doubt be able to retire our national debt.

I also learned from this article that they likewise "reduced the duty on limberger cheese from 15 cents to 7½ cents per pound," all in the interest of and for the benefit of the farmers. These two acts are the outstanding accomplishments of this commission since it was organized by an act of Congress in 1916, of which all of its members feel justly proud. This is the very quintessence of an efficient and faithful public service. Every epochal event in our national history is incomparable to these major achievements. For these momentous, frugal, laborious, and scientific accomplishments they should be extended the thanks of Congress and immediately retired on full pay. Then let it be said of them as was said of Paul of Tarsus, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant; as thou has been faithful over a few things"—lie down and take thy rest. Future generations of agrarians will sing their songs of praise and erect stately monuments to perpetuate their memories down through the corridors of time. "Reduction of duty on quail from 50 cents to 25 cents on each bird," and "on cheese from 15 cents to 7½ cents per pound," the crowning attainment of President Coolidge's administration. I have at last discovered why he is so popular with the farmers and why the country is so prosperous. Ne plus ultra.

I made the statement that the highest-paid mechanic in the steel mills of Pittsburgh paid no more for a bushel of Kansas-grown wheat than the poorest peasant that sweeps the streets of London; and also that he did not necessarily buy any greater quantity of it. In support of this last statement let me quote from the President's recent message to Congress on this very question, quoted verbatim: "Assuming that Europe would have more money if it sold us larger amounts of merchandise, it is not certain it would consume more of our food." These propositions are certainly analogous.

Tariff of every kind and description is nothing more or less than a local subsidy for local industry, meaning higher prices to local consumers. This subsidy is not paid by foreign consumers, for they are not compelled to pay higher prices as we are for the same commodity by virtue of the high protective tariff laws.

Another idea I would like to suggest in this connection and that is: The industries of Europe are at a decided disadvantage in competing in the markets of the United States with the industries of this country. This has been brought about by greater industrial efficiency and mass production methods of the United States, which not only offsets the effect of higher wages paid in this country, but which, as a matter of fact in the majority of instances make the cost per unit of commodities produced in this country less than the cost per unit of similar commodities produced abroad. Therefore, industries of this country can sell these same goods to the consumers at home and abroad cheaper than European industries can sell us similar commodities produced abroad, or even in the very foreign countries where their competitors are the very strongest. As a matter of fact they are doing this very thing each and every day. Do you think they need protection (?) at the expense of the consumer?

Would Senator CAPPER agree that it would be a good thing for the United States, and Kansas in particular, if England, Japan, Germany, and Austria should levy a duty of 42 cents per bushel on wheat? It would be effective in this instance cited above, but not in this country

where we export over 200,000,000 bushels annually, while they are the largest importers of wheat.

I trust you agree with the statement in my letter to Senator NYM that no tariff schedule on the raw products of the farm can be effective where we produce same in abundance in excess of domestic consumption. A great many commodities like the raw products of the farm are on the dutiable list, but the law is ineffectual for the reason stated above. And yet, intelligent people fall for the "bunk" that tariff on wheat, corn, cotton, flour, bran, feed products, cottonseed, and many other raw products of the farm, too numerous to mention, is very beneficial to the farmer. It is nothing but sophistry personified. One must contravene their method of reasoning, suppress their initiative, and stultify their conscience to approve and support such an illogical and refutable proposition. These products were placed on the high-dutiable list in order to deceive the farmers and lead them to believe the Republicans are trying to give them the same benefits of the high-protective tariff as now enjoyed by industry.

I am thoroughly sold on the idea of reducing the tariff schedules on all necessities of life and placing farm implements of all kinds on the free list as the most salutary method possible of relieving the present deplorable conditions of agriculture, in addition to a reduction in transportation rates and reduced expenditures in Government. It is a well-known fact that the consumer ultimately pays all fixed charges and taxes, it matters not how and when incurred.

From the gist of our recent correspondence you can readily see that no one could consistently accuse me of being in sympathy with any high protective tariff act, the McNary-Haugen bill, or one containing the same idea.

I want to beg your pardon for taking up so much of your valuable time, but the fact is, this is the last day of the week, month, and year and I have spent the day reading the *Tariff Review*, and while the subject matter is fresh on my mind I thought I would give you my mental reaction to the contents contained therein.

With best wishes and kindest regards, I am

Yours very truly,

J. K. WELLS.

Mr. McMASTER. Mr. President, in view of the fact that there have been several days' debate upon the resolution, and, so far as I know, only one or two Senators have indicated a desire to speak to-morrow, I would like, if possible, to obtain unanimous consent to agree to have a final vote upon the resolution at 2 o'clock on Monday.

Mr. SMOOT. Upon the resolution and all amendments?

Mr. McMASTER. And all amendments.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. BRUCE. Would it suit the Senator just as well to change the hour?

Mr. McMASTER. To what hour?

Mr. BRUCE. To some later hour, say, 3 o'clock.

Mr. McMASTER. That would be perfectly agreeable to me. I accept the suggestion and ask that we agree to vote at 3 o'clock on Monday.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I would like to ask the Senator from South Dakota if the amendment suggested by the Senator from Maryland is acceptable to him?

Mr. McMASTER. I have not been able to examine the amendment. A slight amendment was made this morning; that is, I suggested this morning that a change be made which I think would cover the amendment the Senator from Maryland proposes.

Mr. BRUCE. The effect of my amendment is to strike out the word "schedules," in line 3 of the resolution, and substitute the words "excessive rates." I understood that that would be agreeable to the Senator.

Mr. McMASTER. I will say that this morning the word "excessive" was inserted in the resolution, and I assume the only suggestion the Senator from Maryland makes is that the word "schedules" be changed to "rates." The word "excessive" is already in line 3 of the resolution. It was put in this morning. But we can look at the matter afterwards.

Mr. BRUCE. The resolution now reads:

That many of the rates in existing tariff schedules are excessive, and that the Senate favors an immediate revision downward of such schedules.

Mr. McMASTER. We have inserted the word "excessive" before the word "schedules." Therefore the only word the Senator from Maryland desires to change is the word "schedules," which he desires to change to "rates."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment was offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. COPELAND].

Mr. BRUCE. That amendment was to put the word "excessive" before the word "schedules," in line 3, was it not?

Mr. McMASTER. It was.

Mr. BRUCE. The effect would be just the same.

Mr. SMOOT. If the word "schedules" is used, it may be found that there are rates in a schedule that are too low and other rates that are too high. I am sure that will appear to the Senator himself.

Mr. McMASTER. That is why it is perfectly agreeable to me to insert the word "rates" instead of the word "schedules."

Mr. BRUCE. With my amendment the resolution would read:

Resolved, That many of the rates in existing tariff schedules are excessive, and that the Senate favors an immediate revision downward of such excessive rates.

Mr. McMASTER. That is perfectly agreeable to me.

Mr. BRUCE. I was sure it would be.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Dakota accepts the modification, and the resolution will be modified as suggested.

Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from South Dakota? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. CURTIS. The unanimous-consent agreement is that we vote at 3 o'clock on Monday.

The VICE PRESIDENT. At 3 o'clock on Monday.

The agreement was reduced to writing, as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

It is agreed by unanimous consent that at 3 o'clock p. m., on the calendar day of Monday, January 16, 1928, the Senate will proceed to vote, without further debate, upon any amendment that may be pending, any amendment that may be offered, and upon the resolution (S. Res. 52) favoring a reduction of tariff schedules and the consideration of tariff legislation at the present session of Congress, through the regular parliamentary stages to its final disposition.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I desire to make a parliamentary inquiry. Is it in order, now that this agreement has been made, to move to take up another bill? That is, would it displace the present unfinished business?

The VICE PRESIDENT. At the hour of 3 o'clock on Monday the resolution will be voted upon; but a motion would be in order before that time.

Mr. JONES. I desire to move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order of Business No. 38, Senate bill 744, to further develop an American merchant marine, to assure its permanence in the transportation of the foreign trade of the United States, and for other purposes. I will state that if this motion shall be agreed to I will ask unanimous consent temporarily to lay the bill aside. I do not desire to displace the resolution of the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. McMASTER. I wish to say to the Senator from Washington that there are several Senators who have expressed a desire to speak upon the pending resolution, and one or two of them were ready to address the Senate this afternoon.

Mr. JONES. My motion would not prevent them from speaking on the resolution. I would have the merchant marine bill laid aside temporarily.

Mr. CURTIS. I hope the Senator from Washington will not insist on the motion this afternoon. A couple of Senators who are not now in the Chamber are opposed to the measure, and they spoke to me about it.

Mr. JONES. I would not interfere with them. I will temporarily lay the bill aside.

Mr. CURTIS. I know; but I think they would like to be here when the question is up as to whether the bill should be made the unfinished business.

Mr. JONES. I desire to give notice, then, that immediately after the vote is taken on the pending resolution, I shall seek recognition from the Chair to move to take up this bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution offered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McMASTER] as modified.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, in view of the unanimous-consent agreement, I suggest that we have an executive session, if no one wants to speak on the resolution now.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Very well.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. CURTIS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 4 o'clock p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, January 14, 1928, at 12 o'clock m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 13 (legislative day of January 11), 1928

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Reese Q. Lillard, of Tennessee, to be United States marshal, middle district of Tennessee. (A reappointment, his term having expired.)

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

To be colonel

Lieut. Col. Douglas Potts, Infantry, from January 9, 1928.

To be lieutenant colonel

Maj. Lesley James McNair, Field Artillery, from January 9, 1928.

To be majors

Capt. Frederick William Huntington, Infantry, from December 14, 1927.

Capt. Howard J. Houghland, Air Corps, from December 15, 1927.

Capt. John James Bohn, Cavalry, from December 15, 1927.

Capt. Roland Roy Long, Infantry, from December 18, 1927.

Capt. Charles Belding Oldfield, Air Corps, from December 20, 1927.

Capt. Carl J. Smith, Coast Artillery Corps, from December 20, 1927.

Capt. Charles Joseph Allen, Infantry, from December 21, 1927, subject to examination required by law.

Capt. John Lawrence Dunn, Infantry, from December 22, 1927.

Capt. James Gregory Monihan, Cavalry, from December 25, 1927.

Capt. William Gaston Simmons, Cavalry, from December 25, 1927.

Capt. Charles Andrew McGarrigle, Quartermaster Corps, from December 29, 1927.

Capt. Alexander Putney Withers, Infantry, from January 9, 1928.

To be captains

First Lieut. Arthur Eugene Fox, Field Artillery, from December 14, 1927.

First Lieut. Carleton Smith, Infantry, from December 14, 1927.

First Lieut. Paul Conover Gripper, Signal Corps, from December 15, 1927.

First Lieut. LeCount Haynes Slocum, Field Artillery, from December 15, 1927.

First Lieut. Edwin Fry Barry, Ordnance Department, from December 17, 1927.

First Lieut. Frederick Harry Black, Field Artillery, from December 18, 1927.

First Lieut. Josef Robert Sheetz, Field Artillery, from December 18, 1927.

First Lieut. Charles Paul Cullen, Infantry, from December 19, 1927.

First Lieut. Frederic Arthur Metcalf, Field Artillery, from December 20, 1927.

First Lieut. Harry Emerson Storms, Signal Corps, from December 20, 1927.

First Lieut. David Dean Barrett, Infantry, from December 21, 1927.

First Lieut. Lawrence James Meyns, Ordnance Department, from December 22, 1927.

First Lieut. Thomas Harry Ramsey, Infantry, from December 25, 1927.

First Lieut. Leon Dessez, Field Artillery, from December 25, 1927.

First Lieut. Lawrence Iverson, Coast Artillery Corps, from December 28, 1927.

First Lieut. Archibald Luther Parmelee, Coast Artillery Corps, from December 29, 1927.

First Lieut. Walter Byron Fariss, Infantry, from December 31, 1927.

First Lieut. John Patrick Crehan, Field Artillery, from January 4, 1928.

First Lieut. Donald Sutter McConnaughy, Field Artillery, from January 6, 1928.

First Lieut. John Theodore Sunstone, Infantry, from January 9, 1928.

To be first lieutenants

Second Lieut. Will Walter White, Air Corps, from December 13, 1927.

Second Lieut. William Jackson Morton, jr., Signal Corps, from December 14, 1927.

Second Lieut. Wilbur Ray Pierce, Field Artillery, from December 14, 1927.

Second Lieut. Donald Henry Galloway, Cavalry, from December 15, 1927.

Second Lieut. Howard William Serig, Signal Corps, from December 15, 1927.

Second Lieut. Daniel De Bardeleben, Cavalry, from December 17, 1927.

Second Lieut. Patrick Weston Timberlake, Field Artillery, from December 18, 1927.

Second Lieut. Clyde Kenneth Rich, Air Corps, from December 18, 1927.

Second Lieut. Paul Wakefield Wolf, Air Corps, from December 19, 1927.

Second Lieut. David Larr, Field Artillery, from December 20, 1927.

Second Lieut. Laurence Carbee Craigie, Air Corps, from December 20, 1927.

Second Lieut. Philip Roy Dwyer, Infantry, from December 21, 1927.

Second Lieut. Sylvester John Keane, Signal Corps, from December 22, 1927.

Second Lieut. Allen Lloyd Keyes, Field Artillery, from December 25, 1927.

Second Lieut. Damon Mott Gunn, Infantry, from December 25, 1927.

Second Lieut. Charles Metz Seebach, Infantry, from December 28, 1927.

Second Lieut. Harry McKenzie Roper, Field Artillery, from December 29, 1927.

Second Lieut. James Henry Workman, Field Artillery, December 31, 1927.

Second Lieut. Charles Wesley Gettys, Coast Artillery Corps, from January 4, 1928.

Second Lieut. Henry James Pitt Harding, Infantry, from January 6, 1928.

Second Lieut. William Shepard Biddle, 3d, Cavalry, January 9, 1928.

MEDICAL CORPS

To be colonels

Lieut. Col. William Lawson Little, Medical Corps, from January 6, 1928.

Lieut. Col. Allie Walter Williams, Medical Corps, from January 6, 1928.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 13 (legislative day of January 11), 1928

FOREIGN SERVICE

TO BE VICE CONSULS OF CAREER

Howard F. Diehl.	Comer Howell.
Richard C. Dutrow.	Odin G. Loren.
George M. Graves.	James S. Moose, jr.
Randolph Harrison, jr.	Charles K. Morris.

UNCLASSIFIED

Howard F. Diehl.	Comer Howell.
Richard C. Dutrow.	Odin G. Loren.
George M. Graves.	James S. Moose, jr.
Randolph Harrison, jr.	Charles K. Morris.

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Clifford M. Cox, Ozark.

ARIZONA

William F. Haas, Naco.

INDIANA

John T. Clapp, Beech Grove.
Charles F. Robertson, Brownstown.
Julia V. Clark, Colfax.
Ebert Garrigues, Francesville.
Ralph D. Gookins, Veedersburg.

IOWA

Fred O. Canfield, Dunkerton.
Andrew C. Link, Dyersville.
Eliza K. Alldredge, Melbourne.
George C. Parsons, Perry.
Nellie Hyde, Rowan.

Chester C. Yelland, Sheffield.
Mary J. Morse, Steamboat Rock.
John A. Hale, Tripoli.

LOUISIANA

Thomas L. Ducrest, Broussard.
J. Rodney Murrel, Church Point.
Robert M. Johnson, Colfax.
Ralph N. Menetre, Covington.
George W. Varnado, Franklinton.
Edward F. Crawford, Gretna.
Shep B. Hanes, Jena.
Lilha B. Brown, Lecompte.
William R. Morgan, Mandeville.
Novilla T. King, Simsboro.
Walter B. Eisely, Tallulah.
Louis Hebert, White Castle.

MARYLAND

William A. Brown, Cecilton.

MASSACHUSETTS

William F. Keller, Holliston.
George A. Coolidge, Hudson.
Leon C. W. Foote, Lee.
Ernest H. Wilcox, Manchester.
Turner R. Bailey, Medfield.
Bernard Campbell, Millville.
Charles D. Streeter, Mount Hermon.
Harold Winslow, New Bedford.
George W. Orcutt, North Abington.
James T. Potter, North Adams.
Alice K. Briggs, North Easton.
Alonzo W. Jones, Orleans.
Palmer J. Lord, Petersham.
Margaret E. Rourke, Prides Crossing.
Mark A. Putnam, Rutland.
William E. Chaffin, Scituate.
Edward L. Chapin, Southbridge.
Wesley G. Rose, South Deerfield.
Maurice Williams, South Easton.
John H. Preston, South Hadley.
Susan F. Twiss, Three Rivers.
Frederick C. Haigis, Turners Falls.
Otis J. A. Dionne, Walpole.
Blanche E. Robinson, Wareham.
Thomas E. Hynes, Wayland.
Alexander Wylie, Webster.
George D. Roe, Westfield.
Henry O. Bailey, West Newbury.
Mary A. Fallon, West Stockbridge.
W. C. Arthur Hebert, West Warren.

MISSOURI

Lester H. Pettit, Ava.
Verner H. Kirkendall, Birch Tree.
Nellie B. Gallihugh, Blairstown.
George C. Blackwell, Breckenridge.
Joe D. Scott, Bunceton.
Edward J. Schmidt, Centralia.
Anna B. Thomas, Corder.
Gustave R. Baumann, Creve Coeur.
Bransby B. Houghton, Crystal City.
Harry C. Grant, Cuba.
Percy B. Kidney, Darlington.
Sallie F. Duncan, Dearborn.
Mandana A. Schriefer, Fornefeldt.
Isaac H. Arnold, Forsyth.
Thomas A. Scott, Greenfield.
William B. Green, Goodman.
George Scott, Higginsville.
John W. Rissler, Houstonia.
Joseph Q. Martin, Huntsville.
Maurice Craig, Ilmo.
Joseph C. Forshee, Ironton.
John G. Kies, Jackson.
Victor M. Blankinship, Kennett.
Hugh L. Virtue, Kingston.
Oliver H. Simmons, Lancaster.
Clyde H. Turner, Mansfield.
Henry H. Jones, Memphis.
Charles S. Dickson, Milan.
John M. Medcalf, Monroe City.
Howard W. Mills, Mound City.

Lulu Ketrow, Mount Washington.
 Ray R. Kelly, New Hampton.
 Celia F. Kerr, New Madrid.
 Eugene E. Wyatt, Oak Grove.
 Sam S. Rutan, Odessa.
 Frank L. Zeller, Oregon.
 Henry O. Hopp, Oronogo.
 Amy B. Buchard, Owensville.
 Bruce C. Maples, Ozark.
 Jesse A. Linthacum, Ridgeway.
 Lou A. Slade, Rocheport.
 Lester S. Eddings, Rogersville.
 Alfred A. Smith, Rolla.
 Luster C. Cottrill, Savannah.
 Rufus G. Beezley, Steelville.
 Waldo E. Andrew, Sweet Springs.
 Estel G. Crawford, Tipton.
 Fletcher G. Smart, Webb City.
 Artie B. Keadle, Wellsville.
 Archie T. Hollenbeck, West Plains.

NEBRASKA

Fred H. Carlson, Alliance.
 Lewis A. Wight, Gibbon.
 John S. Myers, Grant.
 Joseph H. Harrison, Ravenna.

OKLAHOMA

James K. Malone, Allen.
 William S. Sibley, Arnett.
 R. Julian Miller, Bokchito.
 John R. McIntosh, Chelsea.
 Downey Milburn, Coweta.
 John W. Brookman, Coyle.
 Leroy J. Myers, Dustin.
 John W. Bishop, Fairview.
 Thomas H. Henderson, Fort Cobb.
 Frederick M. Deselms, Guthrie.
 Isom P. Clark, Heavener.
 Alfred J. Canon, Hinton.
 Susie M. Daniel, Jet.
 Noah B. Hays, Keota.
 Roy Sherman, Lexington.
 John A. Norris, Okeene.
 William G. Johnston, Oklahoma City.
 Charles H. Johnson, Pawnee.
 Howard Morris, Soper.
 Virgil T. Gannaway, Tuttle.

PENNSYLVANIA

John F. Schwarztrauber, Archbald.
 Annabelle Busler, Avis.
 Harry M. Logan, Conshohocken.
 John E. Cronk, Duke Center.
 Wallace W. Scowden, Farrell.
 George W. Larkins, Ford City.
 Claude W. Keiser, Lykens.
 John L. Eppley, Mechanicsburg.
 M. Irene Workman, Mingoville.
 Howard C. Emigh, Morrisdale.
 John W. Clouse, Moscow.
 Samuel J. Matthews, Olyphant.
 Nora L. Pickering, Peckville.
 Samuel H. Wigton, Phillipsburg.
 Anna B. McCully, Ramey.

VERMONT

Frank E. Robinson, Barre.
 Joshua H. Blakley, Bellows Falls.
 Stanley E. Brownell, Burlington.
 Douglas C. Montgomery, East Arlington.
 Lyman H. Leach, Essex Junction.
 Dora W. Brown, Lunenburg.
 Murray K. Paris, Lyndon.
 Walter W. Wright, North Troy.
 Edward H. Willis, Pittsford.
 Charles W. Humphrey, Poultney.
 Ernest W. Chase, Rochester.
 Earle H. Bishop, West Rutland.
 Belle H. Covell, Williamstown.

WISCONSIN

Theodore B. Ottum, McFarland.
 Walter F. Martin, Mukwonago.
 Mourits Mortenson, Stratford.
 Melvin H. Schlytter, Wittenberg.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, January 13, 1928

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Heavenly Father, we thank Thee for this new day, for health, for happy friendships, for the open sky, for the wide earth; but we pray for the greatest wealth—the blessing of an undefiled heart. May the hand that bears all nature up protect our homes and shield us from the enemy that never abdicates. Thou who art our sovereign Friend, from whom earth's greatest souls have borrowed all their gifts, bless us with music without discord, with purity without stain, and with that peace which is far beyond human analysis. Wherever there are ignorance and restless passion, do Thou shed Thy light and bestow Thy strength. May we hate injustice, smite falsehood, and be consumed with a passion for righteousness, for the glory of Thy name, and for the good of our country. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

FRANK H. FOSS

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

FITCHBURG, MASS., January 12, 1928.

HON. NICHOLAS LONGWORTH,

*Speaker House of Representatives.

SIR: In accordance with your designation of me, pursuant to Resolution 78, adopted by the House of Representatives, to administer the oath of office to Representative-elect FRANK H. FOSS, of the third district of the State of Massachusetts, I have the honor to report that on the 12th day of January, 1928, at his residence in Fitchburg, Mass., I administered the oath of office to Mr. Foss, form prescribed by section 1757 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, being the form of oath administered to Members of the House of Representatives, to which Mr. Foss subscribed.

I have the honor to be,

Yours respectfully,

CALVIN D. PAIGE.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following privileged resolution and move its adoption.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 90

Whereas FRANK H. FOSS, a Representative for the State of Massachusetts, from the third district thereof, has been unable from sickness to appear in person to be sworn as a Member of this House, but has sworn to and subscribed the oath of office before the Hon. Calvin D. Paige, authorized by resolution of this House to administer the oath, and the said oath of office has been presented in his behalf to the House, and there being no contest or question as to his election: Therefore

Resolved, That the said oath be accepted and received by the House as the oath of office of the said FRANK H. FOSS as a Member of this House.

The resolution was agreed to.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMITTEE

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Civil Service may sit during the sessions of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Jersey asks unanimous consent that the Committee on the Civil Service may sit during the sessions of the House. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ADDRESS OF HON. JOHN M'DUFFIE

Mr. BOWLING. Mr. Speaker, on July 1 of last year my colleague, Congressman McDUFFIE, made a very interesting and instructive speech before the Alabama Bar Association on the dangerous tendencies in our Government. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by printing it in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOWLING. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Hon. JOHN M'DUFFIE:

DANGEROUS TENDENCIES IN OUR GOVERNMENT

Mr. President and gentlemen of the Bar Association of Alabama, I wish to express my appreciation of the honor done me by the invita-